

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 813

EA 023 200

AUTHOR Rigden, Diana W.
TITLE Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring.
INSTITUTION Council for Aid to Education, New York, NY.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 66p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, Council for Aid to Education, 51 Madison Avenue, Suite 2200, New York, NY 10010 (\$15.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Cooperative Programs; *Corporate Support; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Development; School Based Management; *School Business Relationship; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS *Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

General guidelines for companies interested in supporting school-based restructuring are offered in this booklet. Following a brief review of the nature and types of partnerships, chapter 2 examines partnerships within the context of school restructuring outcomes and identifies some essential components for developing a reform-model partnership. Three examples of corporate reform-model partnerships are described as illustrations of the development process in chapter 3, focusing on program similarities and potential difficulties. Chapter 4 discusses the five steps of the development process: agreement on specific goals; development of strategies for involvement; identification of costs; assessment and evaluation; and management of the partnership relationship. A recommendation is made for considering the implementation strategy in context, recognizing local needs and politics. Overall reform principles, however, remain constant for formulating general guidelines. An enclosure provides a graph of strategies for involvement. A list of 18 suggested readings is included. (LMI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Business/School Partnerships

A Path to Effective School Restructuring

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Lewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Precollege Series

About the Council for Aid to Education

The Council for Aid to Education, Inc., is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit corporation dedicated to promoting an effective partnership between business and education in the task of improving America's educational system.

Founded in 1952 by the chairmen of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (Exxon), General Motors, and U.S. Steel (USX Corporation), the Council was originally designed to encourage private-sector support of higher education. Today the Council has expanded its mission to include primary and secondary education and to encourage more effective — not simply greater — corporate support of education. Its job is to help ensure that business investments in education produce results.

The Council is supported by business and works directly with business to target key areas of educational concern. It helps point corporations toward the issues and opportunities in which they have a compelling interest and on which they can have an impact. It alerts them to emerging educational challenges and their strategic implications. It provides information on promising approaches to educational improvement. And it offers detailed advice on how to make effective contributions to the quality of American education.

The Council's current agenda of research, consulting, publication, and advertising has been shaped by the corporate community's recognition that education has to assume as important a place in company planning as production, marketing, and research — but that education is often an area where corporations lack the experience necessary to ensure a full return on their investments. The Council stands ready to extend expert assistance to corporations in all their education-support efforts.

Copies of this report are sent free of charge to supporters of the Council. Others may purchase copies for \$15 each, prepaid, from the Council for Aid to Education, Publications Department, 51 Madison Avenue, Suite 2200, New York, NY 10010, Phone 212/689-2400.

Business/School Partnerships

A Path to Effective School Restructuring

Diana W. Rigden

Director, Precollege Programs

Precollege Series

Copyright © 1991 by the Council for Aid to Education

This report is part of a new series of publications on school reform issues and corporate support of precollege education. The expansion of the Council's precollege program has been supported in part by special unrestricted grants from the following companies and foundations: Alcoa Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Exxon Education Foundation, Ford Foundation, International Business Machines Corporation, Johnson & Johnson Family of Companies Contribution Fund, Kraft General Foods Foundation, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Merrill Lynch & Co. Foundation, Inc., Monsanto Fund, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Pfizer Foundation, Inc., Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Starr Foundation, and Westinghouse Foundation.

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Business/School Partnerships and School Reform	3
The Appeal of Partnerships	3
Types of Partnerships	3
Adopt-a-school Model	3
Project-driven Model	4
Reform Model	7
The Evolving Nature of Partnerships	8
Chapter 2: Linking Partnerships to Restructuring Outcomes	10
The Context of School Restructuring	10
How Partners Can Help Schools Restructure	11
Increase Student Learning	11
Extend the Capacity of Teachers	11
Create School Systems that Encourage Innovation	12
Develop Effective Assessment Tools	13
The Essential Components of a Reform-Model Partnership	14
Educator Support for System Reform	14
District Goals Defined in Terms of Excellence and Equity	14
Corporate Capacity for Involvement Identified	14
Stage Set for Developing a Business/School Relationship	17
Chapter 3: Three Partnerships that Support Restructuring Outcomes	19
Champion International's Middle School Partnership Project	19
Project Description	19
Project Summary	22
Education for the Future: Pacific Telesis & Wells Fargo Foundations	24
Project Description	24
Project Summary	26
Panasonic's Partnerships for Systemic, School-Based, Whole-School Change	28
Project Description	28
Project Summary	30
Lessons Learned from the Partnerships	32
Chapter 4: How to Develop Partnerships to Promote Restructuring	35
Five Steps to Develop a Reform-Model Partnership	35
Agree on Specific, Achievable Goals	36
Develop Strategies for Involvement	37
Identify Costs in Resources and Personnel	43
Monitor, Assess, and Evaluate	44
Manage the Partner Relationship	45
Implementation Strategies in Context	47
The Future Role of Partnerships	49
For Further Reading	50
Acknowledgments	51
Precollege Advisory Board Members	52

Introduction

American business made elementary and secondary education its business in the 1980s. Company employees volunteered to work with students and teachers, and plant sites around the country were opened for educational tours. Businesses supplied equipment and resources, provided summer and part-time jobs, dispensed scholarships, and hosted award ceremonies. In many states, the business community took the lead in commissioning studies to evaluate the quality of education and to propose new directions. At city, state, and national levels, company executives played increasingly visible roles in education reform efforts.

Supporting K-12 education was not a new activity for most companies in the 1980s. The nation's schools have had a long history of close interaction with the business community. For decades, companies have promoted vocational education activities and business programs, like Junior Achievement, which strengthen and enhance ongoing school activities. But the boosterism that had long characterized most business interest in the schools began to change in the mid-'80s: it deepened into a commitment to the improvement of the entire educational system at every level — from local classrooms to state regulations. Business began to develop and support programs that would have a profound effect on the school system.

A series of disturbing national reports — most notably, *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 — publicized certain problems in the education system, which convinced business leaders that the economic future of the country depended in part upon their willingness to tackle the hard job of improving schools. To help schools raise students' academic performance, businesses developed special projects and enhancement programs, tutored individual students, and helped teachers in the classrooms. The adopt-a-school partnership model became institutionalized at district and state levels, and by 1989 the Department of Education estimated that there were over 140,000 business/school partnerships (though not clearly defined) in the United States.

Although many individual students and teachers have benefited from these programs, both educators and business leaders have become increasingly frustrated by the ineffectiveness of partnership activities in reaching reform goals. Experience with school partnerships has taught many businesses that their enhancement programs cannot necessarily transform mediocre schools into schools where excellent teaching and learning take place. A small number of students may have been reached through these programs, but the school as a whole has not changed. What is most discouraging is the lack of evidence indicating that their involvement in the partnership — through resources, time, people, and attention — has resulted in better student achievement. Even when programs target specific problems, students still graduate from high school with weak academic skills, the dropout rates remain high, and few minority or female students enter college to pursue degrees in mathematics, science, or engineering. Many business leaders believe that it is time to reexamine their school partnerships and to focus them more clearly toward helping schools better achieve education reform goals.

The Vision of an Excellent School

What is the vision of an "excellent school" that guides educators and their community and business partners through the reform process? In simplest terms, an excellent school is one that exhibits a willingness to examine common practices and make the changes necessary to promote good teaching and learning. Excellent schools stimulate and support teachers and students by establishing a climate that values academic achievement, encourages active learning, and makes schools accountable to students, parents, and communities.

Excellent schools come in many forms, but three common characteristics are the presence of strong, consistent, and caring leadership; the centrality and dominance of teachers in planning, decision-making, and implementing change; and the feelings of empathy and encouragement toward students as they assume responsibility for learning. Schools can begin to develop these qualities by changing vital roles and relationships within schools and reorganizing lines of authority. The business and education communities are becoming comfortable using the term "restructuring" to describe this change process.

Schools that teach students most effectively often involve teachers directly in making decisions on curricula, class schedules, personnel, assessment strategies, student health and behavior, and resource allocation. Many of these schools make sure that parents or guardians are actively involved in their children's education. And central to each effort is an unswerving dedication to teaching students not just subject matter, although that is obviously important, but also how to think. Among other things, we have learned from school reform experiments that students learn better in smaller classes and that they learn better when they assume responsibility for learning. Those involved in an effort to create excellent schools — from within the school system or outside — should also understand that the process of restructuring is ongoing. Community and business partners must be ready to offer critical support at every stage of the process.

In *Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring*, we attempt to help companies already engaged in partnerships better link their support to the restructuring efforts of schools and school districts.

After a brief review of the nature and types of partnerships, we look at partnerships within the context of school restructuring outcomes and identify some essential components for moving into a reform-model partnership. To understand better the process of developing a partnership directed toward school-based, system change, we review three examples of corporate reform-model partnerships and ask some of the tough questions that must be asked if we are to learn from these efforts.

We then present suggestions to help companies develop partnerships that promote restructuring. When reading these suggestions it is important to remember that forming business/school partnerships is, by its very nature, a highly local endeavor. The direction a partnership takes, the methods it uses to promote school change, and its success with different strategies are all strongly influenced by local needs and policies. What works well in a medium-sized community, for example, may not have the same success within a large urban system. Overall reform principles, however, remain consistent and there are some general guidelines for companies interested in supporting school-based restructuring.

Business/School Partnerships and School Reform

The Appeal of Partnerships

What is the initial motivation for a company to become involved in supporting efforts to improve elementary and secondary education? Certainly, a most basic reason that companies enter into partnership with schools is because they believe excellent schools to be in their best interest. Such schools provide needed high-quality entry-level workers, they attract white-collar workers to the community, and they help to build the economic viability of an area. Companies that support local schools or promote major statewide or national school reform programs gain credibility and receive attention as good corporate citizens.

But without dramatically changing their role within the community, companies know that they cannot, by fiat, create excellent schools. Instead, they must seek to help existing schools and school systems become centers of excellence. And school leaders who are determined to make the kinds of decisions and changes required to transform teaching and learning in their schools know that they need support and guidance from the community — from business and community leaders, educators, parents, and others who become partners in the education enterprise.

Types of Partnerships

Partnerships can be defined as the means by which two or more dissimilar parties join together to pursue goals neither can accomplish well on its own. Successful partnerships involve partners with complementary strengths who share a commitment to fulfilling the partnership's functions and meeting its goals. When functioning well, partnerships are mutually beneficial. In partnerships with schools, companies depend upon the special expertise of the schools not only in academic and curricular areas but also in knowing how students learn and how the education system works. Schools rely on their community and business partners to supply management and organizational strengths and additional resources as well as political clout and support.

Obviously, over 140,000 school partnerships encompass a variety of different relationships under the partnership rubric. It is possible, however, to characterize most business/school partnerships as belonging to one of three primary configurations: adopt-a-school model, project-driven model, and reform model. These are not altogether tidy distinctions. Partnerships change over time, acquiring greater complexity as partners develop a commitment to undertake long-term reforms or shift their priorities to meet the needs and interests of changing players.

Adopt-a-School Model

For many, the term business/school partnership means adopt-a-school — a single company selects a single school and provides resources and volunteers to support school activities. Many partnerships begin this way, and adopt-a-school is often a useful first step in building the relationship because it allows both school and company employees to learn about each

other's interests, expectations, and needs. Especially within the context of increased government cut-backs in education spending, the adopt-a-school type partnership offers schools much-needed resources and important additional adult interaction for students. Many adopt-a-school partnerships reflect long-term commitments of companies to individual schools, offering a variety of human and material resources and new opportunities for students and teachers.

Adopt-a-school partnerships with companies have brought to schools equipment, ranging from computers and lasers to new copy machines; people, ranging from employee volunteers tutoring reading and math after school to CEOs in the classroom; and special events, ranging from afternoon book clubs to visits by NASA astronauts and a space shuttle mock-up on Parents' Day. Students benefit from the increased attention and the opportunity to expand their knowledge of other worlds outside the school, and they describe their corporate partners as friends. And it is often through such an adopt-a-school relationship that people develop the sense of trust and confidence in each other that lays the foundation for a more reform-oriented partnership.

However, the title adopt-a-school sometimes connotes a paternalistic relationship in which a benevolent company nourishes and protects a dependent school, typically through volunteer activities and monetary or material contributions for special projects. Generally, when a company adopts a school, one or more employees meet with school officials to identify a list of school needs that the company is willing to fulfill and, more often than not, what the school asks for, the company provides.

Even when an adopt-a-school partnership moves beyond requesting resources to addressing a substantial school problem (the rising number of dropouts, for example), the attention of both partners is frequently paid to symptoms rather than causes. In the case of dropout prevention, for example, a school may ask for, or a company may decide to provide, material incentives to encourage students to stay in school. Neither partner is ready to commit time to work together to identify the academic and social reasons for high dropout rates or to determine what needs to be changed and how such changes can be implemented in ways to preclude students from leaving school. Indeed, schools rarely refuse a company's offer of gifts and resources, even when they recognize that there is little relationship between such largesse and increased student attendance. Businesses involved in adopt-a-school partnerships are typically generous and schools benefit from their attention, but neither partner is in a position to challenge the other to tackle serious underlying problems.

Project-Driven Model

Instead of providing general support through an adopt-a-school type relationship, many business/school partnerships are formed to address specific academic or social problems. When business leaders become concerned about inadequate student achievement in science, for example, they might offer to help schools improve the content and instruction of elementary and high school science courses. The resulting partnership may attempt to find ways to support teachers as they develop new curricula, it may encourage company employees to

produce science application projects, or it may find ways for teachers and business employees to join together to develop a single project. Sometimes a partnership imports programs created and tested elsewhere, and sometimes it will support a school program run by a university or other third-party organization. Whatever approach these partners choose for their project, the focus of their concern is to expand activities in science either directly in the classroom with students or through teacher training.

Project-driven partnerships often develop naturally from an adopt-a-school relationship as school and business partners focus their attention on an individual problem. It is important that project-driven partnerships be evaluated in terms of what they can and cannot accomplish with respect to school reform and restructuring. They are excellent vehicles for enhancing course work and extending learning opportunities for all students involved in the project. When teachers are involved in the planning and development stages as well as in implementation, special projects can have a longer-term influence on how the subject is perceived and taught at the school. But it is only with deliberate and considerable commitment of staff, time, and work that special projects can become an instrument for radically changing the status quo and influencing school reform.

When it is done right, a successful project can change attitudes and practices in the classroom, school, and school system and can significantly improve teaching and learning. Its influence can extend well beyond the physical and time limitations of the initial partnership and, indeed, can lead to long-term changes in teaching and learning strategies. But the evolution of a single project into an effective means for accomplishing school reform requires a significant commitment on the part of both partners. A brief example can illustrate what this means.

For many years, the scientific community has been concerned by the disinterest or lack of qualifications of female or minority students in careers in science. When it became clear that many students are already "turned off" to science by middle school, concerned scientists began to focus on how children are taught science in the early grades. They discovered two not very surprising things: first, most elementary school teachers did not receive an adequate science education themselves and, as a result, were uncomfortable teaching science; and second, teachers — often unknowingly — respond differently to science questions and answers given by white boys and those given by girls or minority boys. With funding from the National Science Foundation, a partnership was created between scientists of the American Institute of Physics and an elementary school district in University City, Missouri, to address these two issues.

The first goal the partnership set was to help teachers learn and enjoy science so that they would gain confidence in teaching science in such a way that students would also learn and enjoy it. To meet this goal, it held three-week summer Content Institutes for all kindergarten through fifth grade teachers, conducted monthly science meetings for the teachers during the school year, and created teams of teachers to develop a hands-on science curriculum for these grades. Two full-time former teachers and two half-time physicists coordinated all of the activities and workshops. Local companies — including

Monsanto Corporation, Ralston Purina, Southwestern Bell Telephone, and McDonnell Douglas — placed representatives on a science advisory board to help the schools build their scientific expertise.

The second goal of the partnership was to identify racist and sexist practices in the elementary school classrooms and to help teachers learn ways to change these patterns. In the first year of the project, an equity audit was conducted: teachers were observed in each classroom, students and teachers were interviewed, and grades and other school records were reviewed. The results surprised and distressed many teachers who learned that they were inadvertently discouraging female and minority students from learning mathematics and science. During one-week summer Equity Institutes, teachers acquired a new sensitivity to the way they respond to their students and learned different strategies that would open the study of science to all students. Throughout the year teachers used peer coaching methods to continue to develop inclusive practices.

After three years, the project, Science Education and Equity Reform (SEER), has exerted an influence that extends beyond the growing confidence of elementary school teachers who know more science and enjoy teaching it to their students. The science-centered elementary school classrooms are now supported by labs, with rooms set aside to store science materials, and a part-time science aide in each elementary school. Also, the district has developed links with three area universities to influence the way new elementary school teachers are prepared to teach science. There are plans already under way to implement project SEER in other school districts in the St. Louis area, as well as in Pueblo, Colorado. In spite of these achievements, the project is still too young to claim success.

The commitment of staff, time, resources, and work which has led to this level of accomplishment is substantial and points to a series of questions that must be asked of any project-driven partnership: Will this revitalized elementary school science experience influence the choices students make in middle and high school science courses? Will the teachers be able to sustain their enthusiasm for teaching science? Will the school system continue the commitment of space, staff, and time it now devotes to the new science program? Will the science advisory council maintain its enthusiasm for elementary school science, and will it develop a solid working relationship with the district? Will the necessary materials continue to be developed and maintained to support "hands-on" science experiences? And, most important, will anybody be around to seek the answers to these questions a few years from now?

What shortcomings there are in the project-driven model are found in its relatively short-term focus and its isolation from the rest of the school activities. Corporate partners are willing to commit their time, energy, and resources for a two- or three-year project, but they are usually unable to maintain a permanent program in the school. Many teachers, already dubious about the appearance of a new "solution" to problems they may not have identified as their first priority, find it impossible to perpetuate the project in their classrooms when the additional resources and personnel are withdrawn.

The success of special projects is often difficult to determine. The flurry of activity that surrounds the introduction of any new project can confuse the results; new resources and

new people are brought into the school with great fanfare and everyone feels hopeful and energized. Although records may be kept and evaluations conducted, the projects are usually not in place long enough to be able to permit tracking of how (or even whether) they have met their objectives.

Another shortcoming of many project-driven partnerships is that neither the corporate nor school partner seriously considers the process of how to transfer the program to other classrooms. Even when partners set out to create a "replicable model" to be extended into other schools within a district or state, they rarely are able to identify the essential characteristics of their project or to understand contextual factors that contribute to its success. How much time and energy does it take to run a successful program? Whose time and energy? What kind of commitment is required by school leaders? How are teachers kept informed and active in both the planning and development and the implementation stages? How does the participation of high-ranking business people affect the project's success? What is the relationship between teachers and program staff? Between adults and students? Between the program and the school? Answers to questions such as these help partners understand what it will take to keep a project in place at a single school and what is needed to duplicate the model elsewhere.

Reform Model

Reform-model partnerships, unlike the more familiar adopt-a-school or project-driven models, are directed to challenging common practices in schools and districts and changing the education system itself. In some instances companies have developed reform-model partnerships after becoming frustrated over the limited accomplishments of their adopt-a-school or special project partnerships. Although company-sponsored special events and programs have run for six or seven years, these companies find that partner schools have not yet significantly reduced the number of dropouts or produced better qualified graduates, and not many more women or minority graduates are seeking college degrees in quantitative areas. And they see no improvement in the abilities of graduates applying for entry-level jobs within their companies.

In part, such frustrations stem from misunderstanding the potential of most partnership activities to solve, or even to address, complex educational deficiencies. A corporate scientist who visits a high school physics or chemistry class (no matter how whiz-bang his lecture and demonstration) will not affect how well students score in the quantitative section of a standardized test. After-school tutoring programs in reading and math cannot bring all students to grade-level achievement if those students most in need of learning do not participate. A gift of four or five computers will not give a school of 400 students a technological edge.

It is important to remember that these activities and resources can be helpful to individual students and to their schools: some students do become captivated by science after seeing an experiment on superconductivity performed in their classroom; other students learn not only reading and math skills but also gain self-confidence by spending hours with their company tutors; and still others develop important technical skills by learning to

program and use the computers. But these activities do not help schools change their current practices to ensure that all students develop the necessary academic skills to learn science or math or reading and make connections among the subjects they are learning.

Some business leaders have come to believe that sustained high academic achievement for all students will occur only when schools change the learning and teaching environment in the classroom, and they have begun to consider ways they can work with a school or school district to support broader reform or restructuring goals of the school. As a result, many companies have begun to focus their partnerships on what may be called the four reform outcomes of school restructuring: **increased student learning, extended teacher capacity, the creation of school systems that encourage innovation, and the development of effective assessment tools.**¹ A partnership directed at reaching restructuring goals will require not only the long-term commitment of both partners (five to ten years at a minimum) but also a resolution to work together to challenge current practices and find more effective ways of allocating human and financial resources to bring about reform.

School restructuring cannot be imposed from without the school by well-meaning business, community, or government leaders. It must be created and developed by those at the school — teachers and staff — who recognize the need for reform and who have begun to explore appropriate ways to change. At the same time, schools undergoing such change need the support and commitment of outsiders to encourage them to experiment with new teaching strategies and organizational schemes, to help them confront reform-defeating regulations, to provide resources as needed, to help teachers with individual projects, and to reach other goals.

The business community pioneered the school partnership movement and has learned a great deal through its experiences. In each relationship with an individual school or school district, companies struggle to direct their resources more productively toward making changes that will have a long-term effect on how well young people are educated. As they begin to focus more clearly on school reform or restructuring goals, business leaders find they must be ready to confront a complex set of problems that are not easily solved and have not been included in their traditional partnership activities.

The Evolving Nature of Partnerships

Partnerships are modified and developed as they mature and as the interests and commitment of individual partners change. The constant renewal of partnerships is necessary to maintain an ongoing and productive relationship. Therefore, it is important to understand the ways in which partnerships are transformed and to anticipate their changing nature.

Early partnership experiences can help build a foundation of confidence and trust upon which companies and schools can begin the much harder and longer process of working together on meaningful reform. After years of sponsoring individual programs in a school, for example, some companies find their school partner willing to accept their advice and

¹These four outcomes are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, "Linking Partnerships to Restructuring Outcomes."

support in developing strategies to tackle tougher questions and problems. As one business executive put it, "It's easier to begin working on making difficult changes when everyone involved is family."

However, although partnerships formed as adopt-a-school or project-driven can certainly transmute into reform-model partnerships, this is not a predictable sequence. In some cases, schools find it easier to accept the partnership of corporate "strangers" to support their restructuring efforts and keep their corporate "friends" involved in more traditional enhancement programs. In other instances, school and company partners form several totally different types of partnerships simultaneously to meet different goals.

Although it seems the logical next step of the national business/school partnership movement to link activities more closely to school restructuring outcomes, there are many questions about how to develop and maintain reform-model partnerships. What characteristics of the school and school district and of the company partner are essential before a reform-model partnership can begin? What is the process for establishing such a partnership? Is there a natural sequence to the issues addressed or activities proposed? How do we make the best use of talent? How do we ensure that partnership activities support reform goals and do not complicate the process or hinder progress? And how can partners keep assessment and accountability issues integral to the reform process?

To determine the best direction for a partnership to take, companies need to remain flexible and work closely with the school and district, and they need to be prepared to learn from their projects and from the experience of others.

Linking Partnerships to Restructuring Outcomes

To link partnerships to school restructuring, companies must examine the purpose of their programs and focus on activities specifically designed to help schools and school systems change the way they educate all their students. Reform-model partnerships should be structured so that they advocate system change and help schools become more effective centers for teaching and learning. Activities and programs that address those goals should be actively encouraged.

Restructuring experiments around the country — for example, the *Coalition of Essential Schools*; "Comer schools" of the *Yale University Child Study Center*; the *Key School Project* in Indianapolis; the *Corporate/Community School* in Chicago² — reveal that it is usually necessary to change the existing school management structure, which is often an impediment to the reform process, in order to achieve successful reform. And to begin the change process, there needs to be a clear, shared vision of what outcomes the reform seeks as well as a strong leader to keep the effort on track. Schools and school systems must undergo difficult self-assessment and implement radical changes if they are to begin to improve the quality of learning for all their students. Although the process is time-consuming, complicated, and risky, it can be sustained with support from community, university, and corporate partners.

So a first role many business partners can play is to help schools and school systems assess needs and develop long-term goals. Then, both the school and the partners can determine what are the best ways outsiders can help schools reach those desired outcomes.

The Context of School Restructuring

The primary goal of all efforts to reform or restructure schools is to **ensure that all students learn well**. The other three related objectives of restructuring — to **extend the capacity of teachers**, to **create school systems that encourage innovation**, and to **develop effective assessment tools** — help schools and school systems reach the primary goal of better educated students. These four goals are intimately interconnected, and many educators believe that to do a better job of educating all students, the other three aspects of schooling must be changed simultaneously: the teaching and learning process within the classroom must be renewed; the traditional organizational and management arrangements within the school and school system must be redefined; and new ways to measure teaching and learning performance must be developed. Business/school partnerships can be instrumental in helping schools reach these goals.

²These and other reform experiments are described in *School Restructuring: Designing Schools for Better Student Learning* (New York: Council for Aid to Education, 1990).

How Partners Can Help Schools Restructure

A quick review of the four restructuring goals may help companies better understand the kind of support they can offer schools and districts undertaking difficult reforms. These goals provide the framework within which school and business partners can decide together how to link specific programs to school restructuring.

Increase Student Learning

The primary goal of restructuring, and of most partnerships, is to help increase student learning in specific subject areas. Through involvement in many different partnership activities, students develop skills and knowledge they will need to expand their options as workers and citizens in the future. Companies work with students in a variety of ways: employees can serve as tutors, mentors, career advisors, and resources; part-time and summer jobs can be made available; special courses and after-school activities in specific subject areas can be developed; special events like science fairs, academic competitions or demonstrations, and entrepreneurial clubs can be sponsored or hosted. These activities all focus on encouraging students to learn well, but their influence is limited to the number of students actively involved in the project, so while some 30 or so students may profit by the experience, no one else in the school benefits.

It is in their limited ability to support system change that we find the greatest difference between traditional partnership activities and those directed toward school restructuring. Reform-model partnerships help schools and districts examine all their practices and should free them to experiment with different ways to teach and learn, new responsibilities and accountability, and a variety of assessment strategies.

The desire to change the roles and relationships of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members presents opportunities for partnership activities designed specifically to promote and support such changes. Among other things, companies may want to:

- Provide funds necessary for schools to experiment with flexible staffing and schedules.
- Use tutoring techniques that reinforce classroom experiences to mentor students who are learning their new role as "workers."
- Link students' out-of-school experiences to in-school learning through internships, apprenticeships, and work/study programs.
- Help teachers and schools connect students to appropriate community and social service agencies.

Extend the Capacity of Teachers

Closely linked to the goal of increasing student learning is the goal of extending the capacity of teachers. Programs that work with teachers have a greater influence on the education process of the school than do programs directed toward students alone. Many schools seek

ways to change what occurs within the classroom, to change how subjects are taught, and to change and expand the roles and responsibilities of both teachers and students. Some of the same restructuring experiments listed earlier show us that extending the capacity of teachers involves providing experiences that deepen and expand teachers' knowledge in subject areas; encouraging teachers to learn and experiment with different ways to teach students from different backgrounds and with different abilities; guiding teachers in new leadership roles and new relationships with students; and helping schools give teachers adequate released time from current duties to take on new roles. In most restructured schools, students are expected to become more active in their learning, and teachers are expected to use a variety of teaching strategies to ensure that *all* their students understand and can apply what they are taught.

Companies can help schools support teachers in their more intensive and time-consuming involvement with their students, help teachers develop new instructional strategies for certain aspects of their subjects, provide opportunities for teachers to learn more about a subject, or train newly formed decision-making teams within the schools. Many business/school partnerships are already engaged in teacher-driven programs that might be linked more closely to restructuring goals. For example, companies could:

- Bring in academic consultants or experts to work with teachers to identify subject matter and pedagogical techniques that would make their teaching more effective.
- Extend teacher internships at the company by sponsoring workshops at which participating teachers share their industrial experience and its potential classroom application with other teachers.
- Develop training programs in teaching techniques, mentoring, or tutoring for both company and school personnel. School partners could help train company volunteers to use coaching pedagogy in the classroom and tutorial work.

Create School Systems that Encourage Innovation

In addition to expanding learning and teaching, schools and school districts around the country have begun to create school systems that encourage innovation. Even the most promising programs, when imposed upon a school through partnerships or other outside agents, last only as long as the private support continues and have little lasting impact on how well the school educates its students. Instead, schools and their community, university, and business partners must engage in the difficult process of creating a capacity for change within the school system. When the rigid school bureaucracy is replaced by a spirit of flexibility and reformation, innovative learning and teaching strategies will become routine. By shifting academic and managerial decision-making to the school site, many school districts encourage those closest to students and their needs to decide what is taught, how resources and staffing are allocated in support of teaching, which courses students are encouraged to take, and what assessment tools are used to determine how well students have learned.

Companies have discovered natural affinities between their corporate management training programs and the new skills needed by school management teams. Through community-based coalitions or through single-company partnerships, business leaders can help create innovative school systems by:

- Working with educators to assess school-system needs, set goals, develop strategies for reaching those goals, and identify how activities and programs sponsored by partners outside the school system can help the district reach those goals.
- Helping the district hire a qualified individual to oversee the restructuring process.
- Bringing in outside experts or advisors to help teachers and school leaders develop new strategies.
- Providing training sites as well as training programs.
- Helping schools appeal for and achieve community support for their new organizational structure.

Develop Effective Assessment Tools

A few school districts and their business partners have begun the difficult task of developing new assessment tools to measure how effectively new teaching and learning strategies are helping schools reach their restructuring goals. Restructuring experiments have revealed that standardized testing alone does not measure the kind of learning promoted by restructured schools. To assess how well students master content and develop thinking skills, innovative schools and districts have begun to experiment with portfolio assessments, which include examples of student performance and demonstration projects as well as test scores.

In developing effective assessment tools, business partners can use the expertise they have gained through corporate education and training programs to help schools:

- Generate, manage, and use assessment information.
- Identify and develop measurable goals.
- Create performance-based assessment strategies.
- Institute an interactive evaluation process.

Such assessment tools require a great amount of time to develop as well as to use, and business partners may want to provide funds for teachers to receive released time to create and learn new assessment methods. Effective evaluation strategies are critical to the long-term success of the current school reform effort. The quality of teaching and learning in the schools will not improve until assessment tools are developed which can measure both what students know and how well they can express and use that knowledge.

The Essential Components of a Reform-Model Partnership

Unlike adopt-a-school, project-driven, or other traditional partnerships, a reform-model partnership is embedded in a commitment to work in concert with a school district to challenge traditions that may be hard to dislodge, and to change those policies that may hinder excellent teaching and learning. While four elements will be identified as critical to the success of a reform-based partnership, one is absolutely essential before such a partnership can even be proposed:

1. Teachers, administrators, and school officials must be willing to support system reform and must strongly desire to change learning and teaching in the schools so that all students learn well.

The three remaining components are necessary for a reform-model partnership to be successful, and listing them may unintentionally imply an order of accomplishment that is misleading and may fail to illustrate their interconnectedness. These elements usually develop out of early discussions between school and business leaders and are influenced by each other:

2. The school and the district must define their educational goal of providing a quality education to *all students*.
3. The company must know what role it can willingly assume, and it must fully understand the nature of its commitment to support the reform.
4. Both partners must consciously set the stage for the relationship and exhibit a willingness to trust each other.

Educator Support for System Reform

School reform cannot be imposed from outside the school or school district. Even if the reform effort is driven by a single education leader, all other parties — teachers (and their union), principal, superintendent, and school board — must be, at least nominally, in agreement when serious school restructuring begins. Their commitment to the effort may grow and strengthen during the process, but no reform is possible if any of these groups actively opposes the effort.

Companies wanting to form a partnership with a neighborhood school or school district that is disinterested in reform are powerless to get such whole-school change considered. They can either direct their attention to a different setting where restructuring is under way, or they can support some individual projects to enhance the educational experiences of students and teachers in the neighborhood school. As stated earlier, these programs will strengthen and supplement the standard curriculum, but their effectiveness will be limited to those few individuals involved in the program.

It is not worth the effort or political risk for a company — even in coalition with other companies and community organizations — to try to force a recalcitrant school board, teachers' union, superintendent, or principal to restructure the schools. In such a situation the best strategy may be to generate communitywide interest in the quality of education for all of its children so that the community can elect new school leaders with the vision to achieve excellence in schools.

District Goals Defined in Terms of Excellence and Equity

The school reform debate swings historically between issues of excellence and equity: between improving the quality of education and extending the opportunity for schooling to a broader student population. In restructuring efforts, schools struggle to combine these two goals. A school or district intent on whole-school change may define its education mission in such terms: *We are committed to the principle that all students can learn well, and we will create schools able to provide an excellent education to all students.*

Once it defines its education mission, the school or district can begin to understand the nature of the reforms that must be undertaken to execute this mission. Most importantly, it must be willing to examine all aspects of the system, asking questions like: What are we aiming for? What needs to be changed? What are the strategies for change? What is the sequence of issues that need to be addressed? And in finding answers to these questions, it must be ready to make the changes necessary to ensure that all students learn well.

Teachers and educators are the ones directly involved in developing a strategy to implement the district's mission, but, as we will see in the partnerships described in the next chapter, business partners can also be helpful in this early stage by providing advisors and consultants, hiring a full-time consultant (sometimes referred to as a "change agent") to facilitate the reform process, or by donating facilities for planning retreats, and so forth.

A clearly stated mission, with identifiable strategies to fulfill the mission, creates an important set of criteria for schools and school districts as well as for the corporate and community partners eager to help them. Schools will no longer need to accept every individual project proposed, but can help partners develop programs specifically designed to reach academic and restructuring goals. And, when business partners understand the district's reform agenda, they can better relate special grants, in-kind donations, and employee involvement to district goals.

Corporate Capacity for Involvement Identified

It is clear that for a restructuring effort to succeed, a school or district must define its mission and be willing to undertake the difficult change process. It is equally clear that a reform-model partnership will succeed only when the corporate partner fully understands the extent and nature of its responsibility to support the reform. As a beginning step, a company needs to specify its own educational goals, taking into account areas of corporate

expertise and strength, the educational interests of senior management, and the school district's reform goals. Once it establishes the purpose for its involvement in a reform-model partnership, a company can begin to determine its role by following a three-step process:

1. **Know** the education-reform issues that influence the district's restructuring efforts, and under what circumstances and with what success they are being addressed.
2. **Choose** strategies for involvement most suited both to company expectations and needs and to the local restructuring agenda.
3. **Manage** the program well by coordinating planning and implementation with the district to develop a clearly focused strategy, monitor its progress, and record its effectiveness.

The knowledge that companies gain about education-reform issues in the district often comes from earlier partnerships with individual schools. Through adopt-a-school and project-driven partnerships, companies and schools gain confidence and trust in working together. The more companies know about the local education scene, the better able they are to support school reform efforts. In addition, many business leaders read national education reports and studies and attend national and statewide meetings at which strategies for restructuring schools are proposed. In some cities, business organizations like the Business Roundtable or Chamber of Commerce have commissioned evaluative studies of school systems and have made recommendations for change. In smaller communities the interaction between senior executives and school leaders is more informal, and discussions on the quality of the schools have led to restructuring plans. Across the nation there is a growing network of business leaders concerned about education and involved in supporting school restructuring efforts.

Learning about the complex, interrelated nature of educational problems in a community sometimes causes business leaders to feel discouraged about what can be accomplished with their limited resources. Instead of trying to address all the problems of the entire school system, company partners need to choose those areas in which they can be most successful. To arrive at a corporate education focus that supports district restructuring goals requires frequent discussions and close interaction between company and school leaders. After such discussions, a company may want to begin by focusing its involvement on a subject area, like science or mathematics, that relates directly to corporate interests, or to an age group, like early elementary grades, with which employee volunteers have already been involved through adopt-a-school programs, or to an area that has been identified as critical to the ongoing success of the schools, like the professional development of teachers. The partnership activities, developed with the close involvement of school staff, should be specifically designed to help reach restructuring goals.

In addition to choosing the direction of its involvement in the partnership, the corporate partner also needs to manage its participation. Since its commitment will be long-term, company involvement must be well staffed and prepared to confront obstacles. Ideally, a full-time person (with support staff) should be responsible for keeping informed on national, state, and local education issues; coordinating and maintaining the company's

commitment to education reform efforts; and working closely with school and district personnel to monitor and advise in the local school reform process. The nature of a company's commitment to the reform partnership is often signaled by its willingness to assign full-time staff and by the authority it vests in that person or department both within and outside the company. The company's commitment of time, staff, and effort to a reform partnership requires the support of senior management and the endorsement of the chief executive officer or even the board of directors.

Stage Set for Developing a Business/School Relationship

As the school district and the company identify their own objectives and determine the extent of their commitment to the reform effort, the perimeters of the business/school partnership are also being established. Partners initially come together because they agree on broad objectives, believe that each has an important contribution to make, and trust that each is working toward the good of the other.

The tone of a partnership — and even its management structure — can be determined by interactions made in these early days. Obviously, for any partnership to be formed, one party must first approach the other. Since reform-model partnerships require the commitment of the district to school-based change, the school or district is often the initiator of a partnership, looking for help to accomplish difficult reforms. Sometimes, however, a company learns about proposed changes and offers its support. In many communities friendly and informal conversations between business and school leaders about statewide or national reform efforts lead to plans to attempt such changes locally. In any case, school and business leaders come together through a shared commitment to improve the quality of education in the local schools by implementing significant changes.

It hardly needs to be said that both school and company partners must agree that there is an important role in an education reform effort for those outside the school system. The definition of that role depends upon district goals and strategies. A business partner brings knowledge about the skills and expertise that young people need to acquire for productive careers and can help teachers better link students' academic experiences to applications in business and industry. On the education side, the company can support the reform process by bringing in consultants, providing the means for teachers to visit and observe other schools, and otherwise promoting the testing of new ideas.

A general description of such reform-model partnerships inadvertently gives the impression that once the basic criteria are met, everything will go smoothly. In reality, when a school and business form a partnership, misunderstandings may arise because of different expectations, attitudes, and behavior patterns; even the different uses of language can pose problems. Especially at the beginning of the relationship, each partner must be predisposed to trust the other. Through developing the partnership and working together to achieve its goals, each partner will learn to have confidence in the motives and actions of the other.

Finally, both partners must be patient and willing to work to overcome resistance to the reform process. The kinds of changes proposed for restructuring schools — changing management structure and procedures, changing behavior and attitudes — are difficult to

accomplish. Because these reforms challenge established practices, many people will feel threatened rather than empowered and may look for ways to delay progress toward restructuring. Members of the partnership should be prepared for what is often a natural resistance to change. And unanticipated events over a period of time may have a bearing on the success of a school restructuring effort. Personnel changes will certainly occur among superintendents, school board members, principals, and teachers; company employees will be transferred and the business itself may relocate. The vision for a restructured school system and the strategies developed to accomplish the vision must be strong enough to withstand these transitions.

Companies involved in partnerships directed toward school restructuring often act as facilitators in the change process. Instead of promoting a particular model for improving the schools, they may be the catalysts that help create the educational and political environment that encourages schools and districts to change teaching, learning, and management practices. In addition, reform-model partnerships seek to consolidate these changes within the system, so that the new ways of teaching and learning become the norm. By looking systematically at three examples, we can begin to formulate some general principles of reform-model partnerships with the schools.

Three Partnerships that Support Restructuring Outcomes

Many companies have begun the process of developing school partnerships that directly support a district's restructuring goals. In each case, they look for ways to link their involvement to those efforts designed to reach the four primary goals of school restructuring: to dramatically **improve student learning** by **extending the capacity of teachers** and broadening teaching strategies, by **creating a new flexibility in the system** through different organizational and management strategies, and by **developing a variety of assessment tools** to measure what students know and how they use that knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

In this chapter we will consider in some detail the experiences of three companies who have defined the focus and goals of their partnerships explicitly in terms of helping schools and school systems undertake restructuring. Champion International Corporation's *Middle School Partnership Project* with the Stamford (Connecticut) School District seeks to create an exemplary middle school education model; the *Education for the Future Project*, developed by the Pacific Telesis Foundation and additionally sponsored by the Wells Fargo Foundation, supports the efforts of seven California elementary and middle schools to transform themselves by empowering teachers, restructuring management practices, and involving parents; and Panasonic Foundation's *Partnership Program for Systemic, School-Based, Whole-School Reform* in nine districts across the country and two state departments of education attempts to improve student learning by working directly with schools and school districts to develop their capacity to plan and implement their own reform programs.

The analysis of these partnerships will be considered in terms of their focus on helping schools achieve the restructuring outcomes discussed earlier in Chapter 2. We will examine the types of strategies developed to reach the reform goals, and the success these activities have had. In addition, the example partnerships anticipate the implementation strategies that will be presented and discussed in Chapter 4. In the Project Summaries of each partnership, we will see how they carried out the five steps of reform-model partnerships — agreeing on achievable goals, developing strategies for involvement, identifying costs, monitoring and assessing, and managing the relationship.

The Middle School Partnership Project: Champion International Corporation and the Stamford (CT) Public Schools

Project Description

In the summer of 1989, Champion International Corporation, with headquarters in Stamford, Connecticut, began to review its precollege education programs in an effort to focus its involvement in a single, broad area rather than support a variety of unrelated projects spread out over many grade levels and subject areas. At about this time, they reviewed and studied *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century*, a report by the

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, which suggested important ways schools and teachers need to change their attitudes and behaviors in working with children from ten to fifteen years old. Champion was particularly struck by the picture presented of the typical middle school experience and what such an experience means for the future of the nation:

A volatile mismatch exists between the organization and curriculum of middle grade schools and the intellectual and emotional needs of young adolescents. Caught in a vortex of changing demands, the engagement of many youth in learning diminishes, and their rates of alienation, substance abuse, absenteeism, and dropping out of school begin to rise.

As the number of youth left behind grows, and opportunities in the economy for poorly educated workers diminish, we face the specter of a divided society: one affluent and well-educated, the other poorer and ill-educated. We face an America at odds with itself.³

Champion used the Carnegie report as the impetus for its commitment to the reform of middle school education and specifically mentioned it in their mission: "Utilizing the recommendations of the Carnegie report on adolescent development, *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century*, Champion International Corporation will assist interested public school districts in Champion communities in the restructuring of their middle schools to improve student achievement and enhance the quality of students' lives." Concerned for middle school students in their local schools, representatives from Champion International and the St. John's Community Foundation approached the Stamford Public Schools and offered to work with the district to find ways to implement the Carnegie recommendations for reform.

Independent of Champion's new interest in middle schools, the district planned to reorganize the distribution of students in school buildings by expanding its three middle schools from seventh and eighth grades only to sixth, seventh, and eighth grades (an increase in the number of elementary school students prompted reorganization plans). At the same time, the district decided to create a new magnet middle school which would focus on science, mathematics, and technology. The combination of Champion's increased concern for these "children in the middle," and the district's plans to reorganize its middle schools led the company to decide to focus its education support programs on Stamford's middle schools.

The company then hired a former middle school principal as a full-time staff consultant and executive director of the partnership to help them work with the school district to develop an effective program for improving the middle schools, and they assigned a full-time company employee to coordinate Champion's \$1.55 million commitment over five years to the middle school partnership. With the St. John's Community Foundation, they sought additional members for the partnership and were soon joined by the Fairfield County Foundation.

Key Carnegie recommendations served as the anchor for developing the *Middle School Partnership Project*. As the Carnegie report advised, the middle schools would center on

³*Turning Points*, pp. 8-9.

creating small communities for learning, teaching a core academic program, and ensuring success for all students. They would be staffed with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents, and those teachers and administrators would be empowered to make decisions about the experiences of middle grade students. And, finally, the schools would foster students' academic performance through special attention to health and fitness, by reengaging families in the education of young adolescents, and by connecting schools with communities.

The steering committee of the *Middle School Partnership Project*, whose nine members include school, company, and community representatives, based the development of the project on three broad goals:

1. To plan, develop, and implement a sixth-to-eighth grade exemplary middle school model in the district's three schools, using expertise and resources from the partnership and the recommendations of the Carnegie Report.
2. To develop a new Magnet Middle School which provides a basic education program with emphasis on mathematics, science, and technology.
3. To provide the structure and support necessary for all middle school students to perform to the best of their capabilities.

These three goals were translated into four specific outcomes with related indicators that could be used to measure success. As stated in the strategic plan, the partnership seeks to reach two outcomes for students:

- *To increase middle school emphasis on academic excellence, self-worth, and pride in accomplishment for all students* (which would be measured by improved attendance, improved academic performance, and improved participation in extracurricular activities).
- *To increase mastery of basic skills* (measured by better test scores and more experience with computers).

It also plans

- *To foster a teaching staff with enhanced skills* (measured by increased teacher participation in staff development seminars, school visitation programs, decision-making teams, and parent/teacher meetings).
- *To create four middle schools that are positive, up beat and clearly support the learning needs of all early adolescents* (which would be measured by discussions with focus groups and by survey evaluations).

Several strategies were planned and are under way to reach each of these goals. The partnership is assisting the Stamford Public School System with their middle school reorganization plans (which will occur in September 1991) by sponsoring a series of workshops for middle school teachers. They brought in outside educators and consultants to run seminars twice a month for teachers and staff. In the first two series of seminars, topics ranged from teaching strategies to restructuring schools through creating small units within

larger schools and empowering teachers through team-building and interdisciplinary teaching.

The partnership combines training programs that focus on the fundamental changes in management, organization, and teaching strategies central to school restructuring with activities of a more traditional nature. For example, to provide additional academic support for those middle school students in the at-risk population, it sponsors the After-School Study Skills and Tutoring Program which offers remedial instruction in basic subjects by high school students, as well as summer tutorial and enrichment programs that combine academic, athletic, and recreational experiences for middle school students.

To create a support structure for students, the partners have developed the Home School Liaison Program and are hiring community liaisons who work closely with middle school students identified as underachievers, frequently absent, and/or showing a poor self image. The community liaisons will help link schools and families through home visitations, phone calls, and counseling with parents and students. Parental involvement programs have been developed under the aegis of the Stamford Urban League, whose "Project Boost," a behavioral-based parent/school/student-enrichment program, provides parental training and a support group network for parents.

The special difficulties students face when they move from one school level to another, particularly during early adolescence, also concerned members of the *Middle School Partnership Project*. As a result, they have helped schools create orientation and transition programs for both parents and students for the transfer from fifth grade into middle school and from eighth grade into high school. The link between school and community is central to each aspect of the middle school plan, and the partners have assisted in developing effective communication strategies among teachers, parents, board of education members, business, and central office administrators.

The district's plan to create the magnet middle school afforded members of the *Middle School Partnership Project* the opportunity to participate in the creation of a restructured school. The partnership sponsored a year-long series of monthly workshops for 28 teachers who expressed an interest in teaching at this new Magnet Middle School. The workshops, directed by a renowned expert on middle school education, focused on such topics as "The Needs of the Early Adolescent," "Middle School Goals and Organization," "Middle School Instructional Practices," and "Developing Critical Thinkers."

Champion was especially helpful in marketing the magnet school concept to the community and to parents. The company worked with the principal to develop an effective presentation for meetings with the parents of fifth graders, and they produced and mailed a brochure to each of these parents. In addition, company employees coached the assistant principal in making similar presentations to fifth grade students. And as the magnet school develops, the partners will continue to help through teacher programs, through equipment and other resources, and through student enhancement programs.

Project Summary

All partners in the *Middle School Partnership Project* agreed that the first priority for action was to extend the teachers' knowledge and awareness of the special concerns of early

adolescents and of issues related to different teaching strategies. The resulting seminar series, held every other Wednesday throughout the school year, has been highly praised both by teachers and partnership members, but many teachers point out an obvious difficulty: "There is too little time for the workshops, and almost no follow-up." The danger exists that without a network of support strategies to encourage teachers to use what they learn, these seminars will go the way of most traditional in-service programs and provide one-hour inspirational experiences with little practical value.

The *Middle School Partnership Project* is still young and is still discovering ways to relate to other ongoing partnerships within the school system. It has already established a link with the Urban League to use "Project Boost" as a means to encourage parent involvement; the partnership soon may find it useful to coordinate academic programs with Champion's employee mentorship program already in the middle schools or to find ways to incorporate teacher training workshops run by other organizations into their partnership.

Achievable goals: The *Middle School Partnership Project* seeks to increase student learning through three of its goals: "to increase middle school emphasis on academic excellence, self worth and pride in accomplishment for all students"; "to increase mastery of basic skills"; and "to create middle schools that are positive, up beat and clearly support the learning needs of all early adolescents." A fourth goal directly addresses the desire to extend the capacity of teachers: "to foster a teaching staff with enhanced skills."

Strategies for involvement: The *Middle School Partnership Project* was formed to accomplish three broad goals: (1) to create an exemplary middle school education model, (2) to create a magnet middle school, and (3) to create a support structure that will help all middle school students succeed. Goals 1 and 3 are discussed, with implementation and assessment strategies, in the partnership's report, "A Plan for the Creation of Exemplary Middle Schools." As described earlier, plans for the magnet middle school are getting under way for a starting class in the 1991-92 school year.

What is the level of corporate involvement? The involvement of Champion International Corporation in the *Middle School Partnership Project* was critical to Stamford's attempt to transform the middle school experience of its students. Consulting with a representative of the St. John's Community Foundation and the Stamford Public Schools, the company helped develop the project's focus and goals, hired its executive director, developed faculty seminars, and brought in consultants to run the seminars and work with the teachers. Champion's goal extends beyond Stamford, Connecticut, however, in that it wants to create a model middle school plan that can be transported to other plant locations. A project similar to that in Stamford has been put in place in Quinnesec, Michigan; and the lessons being learned in these two sites will influence the development of similar projects.

What is the level of school involvement? Although the *Middle School Partnership Project* is just under way, there have already been some major changes in the staff-development decision-making process in Stamford's three middle schools. School development committees, made up of teachers, staff, and principals, motivated by their experiences at partnership seminars, began to explore new programs for their individual schools in team teaching, interdisciplinary courses, and cooperative learning. The district also invited teachers to

participate in developing the organization and curriculum for the new magnet middle school.

Costs: Champion International Corporation has committed \$1.55 million over a five-year period, beginning in the 1990-91 school year. St. John's Community Foundation and the Fairfield County Foundation have pledged \$200,000 and \$250,000 respectively for three years.

Evaluation: Ways to measure success are indicated for each of the four specific outcomes in the strategic report and have been stated earlier. The partnership has begun to collect data that can serve as a base-line to evaluate progress toward reaching the goals and to make mid-course corrections as needed.

Among these indicators of success, however, there is really nothing that describes the institutionalization of changes to ensure that, when a model middle school plan is established, it will become the norm. What kind of measurement could be used to identify the commitment of the school district in encouraging the middle schools to establish their own school goals and priorities? Or do the changes now being made depend, tenuously, on the good will of the superintendent — who may or may not remain in the community?

Managing the relationship: As described earlier, the *Stamford Middle School Partnership Project* is managed by an executive director working with a nine-member Public/Private Partnership Steering Committee. The committee, made up of representatives from the four partners (the school district, Champion International Corporation, St. John's Community Foundation, and the Fairfield County Foundation), developed the partnership goals and monitors the direction of partnership activities. The steering committee reports on the progress of the partnership to a 35-member Community Middle School Council with representatives from the larger Stamford community.

Education for the Future Project: Pacific Telesis and Wells Fargo Foundations

Project Description

In 1989 the Pacific Telesis Foundation created the *Education for the Future Project*, a partnership with several selected California school districts, designed to demonstrate and showcase the impact of school-site empowerment, accountability, and parent involvement on improved student performance. The intent of the partnership is to help schools restructure so that they routinely provide an excellent education to all their students. Pacific Telesis Chairman and CEO Sam Ginn has articulated the vision that drives the company's commitment to supporting school change:

What we in business and government need to do is help schools agree to goals that focus the schools on their single-top priority: raising student achievement. We need to set up a structure that helps schools arrive at these goals and then get out of the way — and let teachers and school administrators develop and implement their own plans and solutions in a framework of high academic standards and the obligations of citizenship.

The *Education for the Future Project* was designed to provide school-site empowerment so that each school develops academic, social, and extracurricular programs to meet the needs of its own students. There are nine underlying principles:

1. Student achievement will only be improved by focusing on the way teachers teach and the way students learn.
2. The focus of attention must be the whole school and its community; specific issues or problems can be addressed within the school setting as appropriate.
3. The school needs an external agent who can help it articulate its vision, develop its plan, and make changes.
4. The school must create an adaptive, flexible, but permanent infrastructure to support changes.
5. Every member of the staff and some parents need to be actively involved within the new school organization.
6. Goals and objectives must be specific, measurable, and focus on outcomes related to student learning.
7. Teachers must have the opportunity to connect with teachers, and schools to connect with schools, to share plans, programs, and strategies.
8. The project "angel" (foundation, corporation, university, or other organization) must maintain its relationship with the school until the reform process is institutionalized.
9. The faculty should have a major voice in selecting a new principal when the time comes.

When it began its *Education for the Future Project*, Pacific Telesis made several critical decisions. It decided to begin at the elementary school level to have the greatest long-term impact on student achievement and then to help the project develop into middle schools and high schools, eventually working with sets of "feeder schools." It decided to focus on restructuring or whole-school change (as opposed to special projects), to include assessment and evaluation strategies from the beginning of the project, and to increase parental involvement in its partner schools. The company originally committed \$2 million for the first five years of the project, clearly intending to renew its commitment to accomplish its goals. What began as a partnership with three elementary schools has grown to include six elementary schools (one of which is supported by a \$200,000/two-year grant from the Wells Fargo Foundation) and a middle school. A second middle school will be added in the 1991-92 school year.

In its programs in elementary and secondary education, the Pacific Telesis Foundation has often relied on the services of a prominent educational consultant and, as foundation staff began to develop the *Education for the Future Project*, they worked closely with their consultant to identify goals and strategies and to establish a program structure. She was retained to coordinate the project, overseeing program development and implementation at each school site.

The schools selected to participate in the *Education for the Future Project* were chosen because they reflect the demographic and geographic variety within California and because the districts, superintendents, and boards of education were willing to empower schools so that they could improve their students' academic performance. During the first year of the project, each of the original three schools went through the process of establishing an educational vision, assessing student and school needs, team building, organizing a school management structure, and planning. The second year began with a full-staff retreat to develop different instructional methods and assessment strategies. And, as new schools are added to the project, they will begin the same process to develop their own "school of the future."

The *Education for the Future Project* was created with two assessment plans: one designed to measure how well each school succeeds in improving student learning, and the other intended to monitor the partnership project and how well it helps schools through the restructuring process. From the school assessments the foundation will be able to learn something more about effective teaching and what effect empowering teachers and schools has on student learning. The project assessment may provide especially useful information to business leaders, however, as it reveals important lessons about the change process itself and about how effectively those outside schools and school systems can help schools institutionalize change.

Project Summary

As with the *Middle School Partnership Project*, it is too early either to claim success or worry about failure in the *Education for the Future Project*. Because the project has a well-defined assessment component in place, it will soon be possible to scrutinize the seven schools and try to discover those essential characteristics that seem necessary for successful school restructuring. What impact does class size have on student learning? What are effective ways for teachers to involve students in their own education? What assessment strategies can measure proficiency or mastery of a subject? What decisions are best made by teams of teachers and staff, and what decisions should be made at the central office? What kind of leadership does the principal provide? How does parental involvement influence how well students learn?

Central to Pacific Telesis's *Education for the Future Project* is the belief that school improvement is both a bottom-up and top-down effort, but that the bottom-up effort must precede the top-down. Before we can begin to develop strategies to change district and state education systems, we need to learn how schools can become effective. From our experience with this project, we will be able to identify the resources, infrastructure, and governance schools need to achieve and sustain effectiveness.

Achievable goals: The *Education for the Future Project* was initiated to create school systems that encourage innovation. Instead of imposing a change process on a school or district (which would be the antithesis of empowerment), the project seeks to create the context and provide the necessary resources for schools and districts to establish a process for change as

well as a management strategy that will allow change to happen. To reach this goal, the partnership has set about extending the capacity of teachers through workshops and seminars at which teams of teachers, staff, and administrators assess needs, develop strategies to improve the school, and determine the best methods to reach their goals. The ultimate goal for which teachers and schools are empowered is to increase student learning.

Strategies for involvement: The strategic plan for creating *Education for the Future Project* schools is essentially to implement a process of school empowerment: (1) involve the entire school staff in a two- to three-day retreat at which they assess student and school needs and establish an educational mission for the school; (2) create four action teams — Curriculum, Teaching, Leadership and Management, and Parents and Community — with each member of the staff serving on one (student action teams are also formed at most project schools); (3) develop a leadership council for the school made up of action team leaders, the principal, an elected project coordinator, and others (such as grade level representatives) as appropriate; and (4) encourage and support the implementation of strategies as developed by the leadership council and the action teams.

What is the level of corporate involvement? Although funding from the Pacific Telesis Foundation and, for one school, from the Wells Fargo Foundation is critical at the beginning of the program, the most important role the companies play in the *Education for the Future Project* is that of catalyst for change. They have used their influence to motivate districts to overcome impediments and implement school empowerment and to encourage the larger educational community to understand school empowerment as a fundamental component of school improvement.

What is the level of school involvement? The selection of a school district for participation in the project was determined by the willingness of that district and its constituents to undertake major change. The district agrees to give local schools power to make decisions and to modify those regulations that affect the school's ability to improve student outcomes. Each partner school makes a commitment to offer a challenging academic program to all students, to encourage cooperative learning techniques so that all students can better master the subject material, and to offer a variety of instructional strategies for teaching and learning. This commitment to change — both from the district and the school — is the foundation on which the school's leadership council and action teams build their strategy for better student learning.

Costs: Originally, Pacific Telesis Foundation announced a \$2 million, five-year commitment to the project, but, as foundation president Tom Donahoe says, "We will exceed the \$2 million before the five years is up, and we know that five years won't be long enough to accomplish all that needs to be done. We anticipate we'll be involved for some time to come." The Wells Fargo Foundation is supporting the development of the project in an elementary school in Long Beach, California, with a \$200,000, two-year grant.

Evaluation: The Pacific Telesis Foundation established an extensive monitoring and assessment plan that will provide useful lessons both for expanding this project and for transplanting this kind of reform into other communities. First, the project will be assessed

through several instruments, including a pre/post survey to assess the perceptions of all participants (principals, teachers, parents, and students) on school management, communication effectiveness, and opportunities for professional growth. There will be school recordkeeping forms, completed each year by every staff member, to monitor test scores, pupil-teacher ratio, attendance, and parent/volunteer participation. Each year all four action teams will complete a survey form describing their objectives, activities, results, and plans for the future. These surveys will provide the most important information about student achievement, linking objectives like "to increase reading proficiency in the third grade" to actual results.

In addition to these assessment procedures, the *Education for the Future Project* has retained an historian to study the effects of restructuring on the schools and to discover the pitfalls of the project. This activity, a sort of anthropological study of the project, identifies unintended as well as anticipated results and helps participating schools keep focused on their original goals.

Managing the relationship: Like the *Stamford Middle School Partnership Project*, the *Education for the Future Project* has retained an educational consultant to direct the change process in the local schools. At faculty and staff retreats, each partner school, with the consultant's guidance, established the mission statement that would serve as the reference point to guide the future direction and growth of the school. The staff formed four action teams (Curriculum, Teaching, Parents and Community, and Leadership and Management), selected a team leader, and developed a set of goals and a performance plan for each category. Among the issues the teams would address are student mastery of basic skills, computer literacy, teacher training workshops in cooperative learning and peer coaching, parent involvement workshops, better communication strategies, and increased student government. The staff also selected a school project coordinator who would serve with the principal and the team leaders on the school's Leadership Council. The Leadership Council is responsible for leading the school through the restructuring process and keeping its programs and projects focused closely on achieving the school mission.

The Pacific Telesis Foundation has established an *Education for the Future Project* Advisory Council with 18 members made up of key leaders in the education community. This advisory council provides advice and counsel to participating schools and districts about the content of their programs, but its primary purpose is to determine what are the implications of the project for top-down efforts to improve schools. The advisory council will also assist in finding ways to showcase the schools and replicate the project at other locations in the state and the nation.

Panasonic's Partnerships for Systemic, School-Based, Whole-School Change

Project Description

The Panasonic Foundation (formerly Matsushita Foundation) provides encouragement and support through partnerships designed to foster school-based, whole-school, systemic

change in those districts willing to examine the way they educate their students and search for more effective ways to help students learn. The foundation has three objectives for its school improvement program:

1. To make everyone in the education system more reflective about the goals of schooling and to question "business as usual."
2. To stimulate and provide training for school-site personnel so that they can assume more responsibility for the education of their students.
3. To enable district administrators to become active supporters and facilitators of school-based, whole-school reform.

Unlike most other corporations with education support programs, Panasonic does not form partnerships with schools located near Panasonic or Matsushita plants. It has selected as partners nine school districts (and two state departments of education) that are engaged in full-scale school restructuring experiments. These districts possess several basic characteristics: a serious concern for the quality of education for all students, a commitment to examining every aspect of the school system critically, a venturesome attitude toward taking risks in the pursuit of effective teaching and learning, a willingness to reallocate human and financial resources to bring about reform, and a desire to work over an extended period of time with an outside organization actively engaged in their reform efforts.

Over a five- to ten-year period, the foundation and the school district join in a partnership established to achieve improved student learning, greater teacher professionalization, and greater capacity of systems (including district and state departments) to support and facilitate school-based reform. The Panasonic Foundation does not believe that any serious reform will take place if change is imposed upon a skeptical or unwilling school. Instead, Panasonic seeks to increase the school's capacity for change by providing consultants and technical assistance that will enable educators to explore and experiment with innovative concepts for designing and delivering instruction to students and for organizing and managing their schools.

Central to the Panasonic Foundation's *Partnership Program* is the belief that the school itself must be the locus of reform and that local needs differ. Since no two schools are alike, no one outside the school can prescribe a single model that exemplifies the right way for it to educate its students. Instead, the teachers, principal, and school staff must themselves be completely committed to change, they must be in the lead of any effort undertaken, and they must work as a team to develop an effective education program. Moreover, if reform is to be successful, it must be coordinated and supported throughout the whole school; it cannot be the project of a few reform-minded teachers. And finally, the district and school board must nurture, support, and encourage the changes and not impede school empowerment. In instances where schools resist change, the district's role is to provoke, without mandating, change.

What Panasonic offers to its partner schools is advice and technical assistance from staff and consultants, training workshops and seminars by education experts, and funds to convene meetings, travel to workshops, or visit and observe teachers and their classes in

other schools. The purpose of all foundation activities is to play a catalytic role in promoting school reform, to run interference for the schools, to solidify commitment to change, and to create a milieu that enables change to occur within the school.

Panasonic's partnerships are under way with a number of schools in Allentown, Pennsylvania; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Englewood, New Jersey; Miami, Florida; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Rochester, New York; San Diego, California; Sante Fe, New Mexico; and Seattle, Washington. The state departments of education in New Mexico and Minnesota are also using the expertise and support of Panasonic in reviewing ways to restructure their relationships with districts and schools.

Like the restructuring partnerships described earlier, the Panasonic Foundation does not prescribe any particular education model. But in challenging schools to question conventional school practices, it facilitates many of the changes that characterize school restructuring experiments. A recent evaluation of two Panasonic-funded restructuring programs reveals the following changes.

Schedules are being changed to allow teachers more time for planning and staff development and to create longer instructional periods. Class sizes were reduced and smaller "houses" have been created within larger schools to provide students and teachers opportunities for closer interaction.

Management changes provide opportunities for collegial planning in curriculum, teaching, and assessment. Districts are allowing schools to make decisions in planning, personnel, budget, and administrative areas. And equipment, materials, and other resources have been brought to the schools to enhance instruction.

Instructional changes include team teaching experiments and attempts to align teaching strategies with the goal of ensuring the academic success of all students. Student instruction groups have been established, and special programs set up to provide linkages to the community.

Assessment changes are beginning to be introduced to discover effective ways to measure whether students reached desired outcomes. A new system of rewards and sanctions is being devised to help all students achieve success in their courses.

The foundation has established simple criteria for its partner schools to determine the success of their reform activities. The schools are asked to examine each practice and ask: Does this lead to good teaching and learning? Does this make sense? What would happen if we did it another way?

Project Summary

Early indications, as well as formal evaluations, reveal that the Panasonic Foundation *Partnership Program* has been effective in promoting systemic, school-based reform through many of its partnerships. However, as with most other restructuring efforts, it is premature to assess the permanence of the profound changes that are taking place or their contribution to better student achievement.

The driving force behind school restructuring is the assumption that teachers who are actively involved in making decisions about teaching and effective school practices will be better able to engage students in learning. And, indeed, the Panasonic Foundation's partner schools report that student attendance is up, that students are getting better grades, and that they are taking more responsibility for their learning. But how permanent are the changes that have led to these encouraging results? Are schools and school systems simply trying on the latest, most fashionable reforms, intending to discard them when some new fashion in reform surfaces?

The ultimate goal of reform-model partnerships must be to create a better, more responsive system that integrates school restructuring changes so that they set a new, higher standard of outcomes on which the next set of education reforms can be targeted.

Achievable goals: The focus of the Panasonic Foundation *Partnership Program* is stated explicitly in its literature: "The partnerships are designed to improve student learning — for all students and for each student — by working directly with schools and school districts to develop their capacity to plan and implement their own reform programs." Like the other partnerships featured in this chapter, the Panasonic Foundation seeks to accomplish this goal by empowering teachers and schools to change and by changing the ability of the system to support school-level change.

Strategies for involvement: We mentioned earlier that the Panasonic Foundation's *Partnership Program* involves a variety of different schools, school districts, and even state departments of education. In addition, the foundation does not subscribe to any particular education model or reform strategy; there is no single strategic plan that the foundation follows to generate the kind of rethinking of school goals and management that will create substantial change in the schools. However, the foundation's activities are based on certain principles that a school or district must agree to before it will get support and advice from Panasonic Foundation: individual schools must be the locus of reform; reforms must aim at improving the whole school; every aspect of the system must be available for examination and change; reallocation of people and resources must be possible.

What is the level of corporate involvement? The Panasonic Foundation's role is advisory, to stimulate thinking and act as a catalyst in helping schools and school systems begin and sustain the process of restructuring. Neither foundation staff nor their consultants dictate the changes that must be made; instead, they guide the school and district into defining changes and gaining the expertise to carry them out.

What is the level of school involvement? The schools and districts with which Panasonic Foundation forms partnerships fit a clearly defined profile. They are committed to examining every aspect of the system, from classroom through administrative procedures, and they are willing to question the way things have always been done and to try different methods. Along with this deliberate self-evaluation, partner schools and districts experiment with different ways of organizing students, the school schedule, and the curriculum. They encourage and enable teachers to make a greater commitment to their students and provide time for training and workshops, and they promote increased parental and community

involvement in the schools. Restructuring at the district level is also required of Panasonic partners, not only to support the school's reorganization efforts, but also to shift control over budget, staffing, and selection of instructional materials from the central office to the school site.

Costs: Most of the partnerships formed between a school or district and the Panasonic Foundation involve modest amounts of money, but extended periods of time (up to ten years). To date, the Panasonic Foundation has committed \$1.7 million over three years, working in nine districts; the anticipated ten-year expenditure will be \$6-7 million.

Evaluation: Internal monitoring of individual partnerships is an ongoing process, and the foundation has commissioned full evaluations of several long-term partnerships.

Managing the relationship: The Panasonic Foundation has chosen to concentrate on building the capacity for change within individual schools and school districts by providing resources and supporting their efforts to restructure. It does not, therefore, establish a formal structure to manage its partnerships, nor does it suggest an organizational model for the schools. Instead, foundation staff relate to partner schools and districts through several different types of consultancies, helping schools develop strategies to assess needs, create strategic plans, reorganize management procedures, encourage innovative teaching methods, increase parental involvement, and develop effective assessment tools.

Lessons Learned From the Partnerships

The three comprehensive reform-model partnerships described above have a **common major restructuring focus:** to meet the goals of better teaching, better learning, and more community and parental involvement in their schools and districts, by creating a system that has within itself the capacity to change teaching and learning and by empowering teachers and staff.

To develop the capacity for change within schools, the partnerships have chosen remarkably similar strategies: first, establish the school and district's willingness to change; second, work with teachers, staff, and the principal to assess needs and develop a vision of what the school must accomplish; and third, establish an assessment component that will indicate how well changes in the school contribute to meeting those goals and how well the partnership itself supports the restructuring process. The participation of outside advisors is an important component of all three partnerships, but the roles of these advisors differ. Both Pacific Telesis and Champion International retained a consultant to work with school and district personnel over a period of several years as they develop and implement a strategic plan of action; Panasonic Foundation brings consultants to the school and district as needed to advise and provide guidance, but not to coordinate the restructuring process.

The commitments of **time and money, corporate and school personnel** support the theory that time, intelligence, coordination, and support are the ingredients of successful school restructuring. Although the financial commitment of the corporate partners is not inconsequential, money is not the point of these partnerships. It is the means to free up

school personnel, provide focused training seminars, and help prompt the district to respond quickly to changes.

Each of these partnerships has a **provision for assessment**, although the Pacific Telesis Foundation's *Education for the Future Project* has the most clearly defined scheme. It has established a process for monitoring changes in student attendance and achievement, as well as for assessing the effectiveness of restructuring experiments like school-based management teams and increased parental involvement. Within these individual partnerships, however, teachers and schools should be encouraged to use different types of proficiency assessments to measure the quality of student learning (and they will need both special training in different assessment strategies and released time to learn, evaluate, and use new testing measures).

Schools, and their business partners, are understandably interested in finding effective tools to reveal how well reforms improve the quality of learning. There is a tendency to seek immediate successes that reinforce new projects. Restructuring is an ongoing process to change behaviors, attitudes, and relationships, and it is important to remember that many of the activities in reform-model partnerships may not be quantifiable; in addition, other factors within the school and district will affect the results of the project.

Finally, the **partnership management** strategies are also remarkably similar in these three examples. Each program provides experienced consultants and outside experts who can help faculty, staff, and school administrators gain expertise, provide resources and support, and make a long-term commitment to continue to nurture the reform effort.

In addition to these five criteria, there is another striking similarity among the three partnerships, particularly when compared to traditional partnerships. These reform-model partnerships have relied on very few company volunteers in the early stages of creating and running the programs. While local school committees may decide to link company and community volunteers and mentors to their reform program, the partner company has not begun with extensive employee involvement. Since volunteers play such a significant role in more traditional partnerships, it may be important to find ways to help schools find effective uses for existing volunteers and mentors within their reform efforts.

Restructuring partnerships directed at empowering schools for change, such as those described in this chapter, are fairly recent. (The Panasonic Foundation formed its first partnerships for whole-school change in 1987; both Pacific Telesis and Champion International began their partnerships in the 1989-90 school year.) Yet, the knowledge we are gaining through these early experiments should be helpful to other companies as they begin to develop reform-model partnerships.

Company partners identify the key element as teacher involvement. The teachers, principal, and staff of the local school must direct the change process: they identify needs, develop the school's academic mission in terms of outcomes, and plan ways to achieve the outcomes. To go through this process effectively, the local school site needs the authority and expertise to make decisions, and each site needs to be held accountable for its work.

However, there are three potential difficulties that can arise in the process of empowering schools for change.

- **Believing in quick fixes.** Many of the changes being advocated for the schools can be viewed as fashionable: school-based management, local school councils, parental involvement, cooperative learning, integrative education, and so forth. These reforms may encourage educators to believe in the latest "silver bullet" that will magically resolve all their education problems. Partners must guard against adopting superficial changes that do not lead to an integral transformation of behavior and attitudes in the classroom.
- **Forming an elite reform corps.** In almost every school there are dedicated teachers who are looking for ways to be more effective in their teaching. This group is usually a powerful ally to a corporate partner and can form an activist core for the restructuring effort. Using such a group may be an expedient way to get started in a school, but there are drawbacks to this "empower the movers" strategy. These teachers may form naturally into an elite group, and other teachers could quickly dismiss or resent their recommendations. The tension within the school between those advocating and those resisting change may add to the already difficult task of negotiating new roles between school and district. To avoid this kind of situation, it may be better to involve the entire faculty and teaching staff from the beginning of the restructuring process.
- **Holding on to power.** The rigid hierarchy and political realities of school districts do not easily give way to new roles and responsibilities. Most central administration offices still do not operate in a way that supports teachers and schools and facilitates the reform process. No one sets out deliberately to obstruct learning and teaching, but we know that many current practices hamper teacher creativity.

For example, the school day may need to be reorganized so that teachers and students have sufficient time to explore information in-depth and develop and expand ideas. Time, space, and encouragement may be needed to help teachers begin to plan together to set goals, develop courses and programs, and decide how best to use resources.

In reform-model partnerships, we have seen that the company partner plays an important role as advisor and consultant. In addition to hiring consultants and providing resources, however, the company also must consider ways to run interference for the school and its restructuring programs. The gains made in restructuring experiments are highly vulnerable to setbacks, and partners need to ensure that, while they understand school restructuring as an evolving, on-going process, they also seek to integrate reforms into the system.

How to Develop Partnerships to Promote Restructuring

As we look at ways companies have begun to focus their partnership programs on helping schools reach reform outcomes, we see them supporting schools as they restructure or redesign their organizational, managerial, and decision-making processes as well as the teacher-student interactions within (and sometimes outside of) the classroom. The kinds of support that business partners offer the schools and school districts depend not only upon the school's reform strategies but also upon the capacities and commitment of the company.

Both school and business partners must recognize that restructuring is a long process, and some outcomes may not be measurable for twelve years, the traditional number of years students move through the school system. At the very minimum a reform-based partnership should be set up for five years, although ten years of sustained commitment by all partners would more successfully institutionalize the reforms.

There are many useful manuals on the step-by-step process of creating traditional business/school partnerships and developing activities and special projects. Several of these are listed in the final section of this report, "For Further Reading." What follow are some ideas on how to develop a new partnership formed specifically to support school restructuring and how to extend existing partnerships into a new dimension.

Five Steps to Develop Reform-Model Partnerships

The five basic steps to develop a partnership aimed at helping schools and school systems change are different in focus and application from those steps taken to form traditional partnerships.

1. Partners in a reform-model partnership must identify partnership outcomes that directly relate to restructuring outcomes.
2. In reform-model partnerships these strategies for involvement must not only be directed at helping the district make the changes necessary to achieve restructuring goals but also at incorporating those changes into the structure of the school and district.
3. All partners must understand the additional costs in resources and personnel that the restructuring effort will require.
4. The partners need to establish a system to monitor, assess, and evaluate how well partnership activities help the school and school system reach restructuring goals.
5. The partner relationship must be managed so that it effectively fulfills its responsibility as a catalyst to school restructuring.

In reviewing the example partnerships in Chapter 3, we looked briefly at ways in which they implemented these five steps. The description of creating a reform-model partnership

and the list of possible activities that follow are more extended and more orderly than can possibly be expected in the real world. They are intended to provide guidance and basic information with which partners can begin to develop a reform-model partnership that makes sense for the educational needs and political context of their community.

Agree on Specific Goals

The four major goals of school restructuring — to increase student learning, to extend the capacity of teachers, to create a school environment that encourages innovation, and to develop effective assessment tools that measure academic proficiency — have been discussed briefly in Chapter 2. When appropriate, these outcomes have been featured in the discussion of example partnerships in Chapter 3. The four broad goals provide a framework within which each school and school district can develop its reform program through specific objectives that will vary depending on school needs and community context. Business, community, and university partners can then use the goals to develop appropriate strategies and programs to help schools successfully reach these outcomes.

Before describing ways to develop strategies for partner involvement in school restructuring, it may be useful to extend what has already been said about each restructuring goal. What kinds of student learning should be promoted by school restructuring? What knowledge and skills should teachers be able to exhibit? What changes are necessary for a school system to encourage innovation? And what assessment tools would effectively measure teaching and learning in a restructured school?

When a goal is set to **increase student learning**, partners expect students to achieve certain basic academic requirements and exhibit extended academic and social skills:

1. All students will master their course work, attain high reading proficiency, exhibit clear writing skills, and display mathematical competence.
2. All students will develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills that allow them to understand relationships and connections among ideas, weigh alternatives, and make thoughtful decisions.
3. All students will develop the ability and confidence to move beyond what they know and explore new ideas.

The partnership works with the school **to extend the capacity of teachers** by helping them extend what they know and learn alternate ways to teach it:

1. Teachers will be provided the opportunity and means to keep abreast of their subject area and knowledgeable about its applicability in nonacademic settings.
2. Teachers will be encouraged to learn and use a variety of teaching strategies with their students.
3. Teachers will have the time, resources, and support to plan courses, develop curriculum, work closely with colleagues, and establish long-term relationships with students.

To achieve these learning and teaching goals, the partnership must help to **create a school system that encourages innovation** through visionary leadership and flexible management strategies.

1. School and district leaders will work with teachers to set system goals and establish the district's education mission while creating opportunities and resources for each individual school and classroom to change teaching and learning strategies.
2. The management structure will be redesigned to bring decision-making to the local school level when appropriate and to minimize bureaucratic interference in the individual school restructuring effort.
3. District education policy will support ways to create classrooms and schools that provide each student the opportunity to succeed academically.

Finally, partners need to **develop assessment tools that measure teaching and learning in a restructured school.**

1. At each level in the educational arena — national, state, local, and classroom; elementary, secondary, and higher education — agreement must be reached on what skills and knowledge should be expected of all students.
2. Assessment tools must be developed to measure student mastery of factual knowledge as well as student proficiency in problem-solving, analysis, comprehension, data collection, evaluation, synthesis, and written communication.
3. Evaluation standards and scoring rubrics must be created that provide a consistent, accurate, and reliable measure of student knowledge and academic performance.

Develop Strategies for Involvement

Once partners have defined goals in terms of concrete restructuring outcomes and created a management structure, they are ready to identify strategies for reaching their objectives. The expertise and individual capacity of partners will vary greatly, and the partnership should offer a variety of alternatives for those interested in making either short- or long-term commitments to the reform effort. School and company partners may want to begin with some joint projects that can be done easily and well — like providing much-needed equipment, establishing homework hot-lines, launching the partnership with a communitywide education conference — since early successes will strengthen the partnership and provide incentive to move on to more difficult and challenging programs. In each case, however, activities should be designed to help schools and school systems reach their reform goals.

There is a natural hierarchy of activities. Some outcome goals are fairly routine — student mastery of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, for example — and familiar kinds of programs can be set in place and maintained to help the schools reach them. Other goals, such as those that require changing behavior and attitudes, are complex,

and programs designed to achieve them are harder to develop and will take longer to succeed. Through the partnership, school and company leaders need to choose among priorities, establish a reasonable time frame for the development and implementation of programs, and agree on benchmarks and evaluation strategies to keep the program on target. In deciding how best to help schools reach their reform goals, partners should use the strengths of the partnership and take advantage of the resources and expertise available.

Companies have three means by which to help their school or district partner achieve its education goals: (1) they can share human resources and expertise, (2) they can share material resources, and (3) they can serve as advocates for change. The grids on pages 39-42 provide a useful starting point for partners to begin to plan strategies and programs linked closely to school reform outcomes.

Although each of the categories listed for possible involvement includes suggestions that look familiar from more traditional business/school partnerships, it's not "business as usual" in reform-model partnerships. To create the kinds of changes that will have a lasting impact on the schools, companies must define these activities in terms of restructuring outcomes. In other words, when the partnership seeks to reach the goal of **increased student learning** by helping students master basic skills, company tutors and mentors will need to be trained in coaching skills so their teaching methods reinforce the kind of teaching going on in the restructured classroom. Corporate-based curriculum projects should be designed to teach students critical thinking skills by focusing on real-world business problems and require students to analyze data, synthesize ideas, and work with others to decide on the most appropriate solutions. And partnership efforts directed toward fostering self-esteem would help students develop the self-confidence to take risks and the self-awareness to know their options for the future.

In working to **extend the capacity of teachers**, the business partner should, whenever possible, work directly with teachers to develop the kinds of workshops and seminars that will provide them with the knowledge and training which they identify as important. For example, teachers may want to learn better ways to assess proficiency, and companies could provide consultants from the human resources department to discuss business experiences with proficiency standards and performance-based tests and begin to work together to identify lessons that could apply in a school setting. Teachers with new decision-making responsibilities may decide that they need company managers and facilitators with experience in teaching team-building strategies. As we saw in the example of Champion's *Middle School Partnership Project*, teachers may want to learn more about different teaching methods — interdisciplinary planning and teaching, cooperative learning, integrative learning — and a company partner could bring experienced educators into the district for a series of seminars. Teachers in different subject areas may be interested in expanding their knowledge through company-sponsored seminars. For example, writing teachers may want to know more about work-related writing; science and mathematics teachers may be interested in learning about on-site applications of the principles they teach in the classroom; political science teachers may want to learn more about the role of corporate lobbyists in state and national government. When teachers and company representatives plan workshops together, the potential for gaining useful information and strategies is great.

Strategies for Involvement in Reform-Model Partnerships

COMMENT: Given the nature of school-based system reform, companies forming a partnership with a restructuring school or district must work closely with teachers and staff to coordinate their human and material resources and advocacy roles to restructuring goals.

Goal 1: To Increase Student Learning

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Master course work -reading -writing -mathematics	Provide training in coaching skills for tutors, mentors, and employee volunteers.	Link gifts of lab equipment, books, computer technology and software to teacher training. Provide grants for curricular programs directed toward restructuring goals.	Advocate national standards.
2. Develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills	Provide scientists and lecturers trained to help students discover solutions to real-world problems.	Design summer job experiences and internships to help students develop higher-order skills.	Advocate changes to student assessment programs.
3. Increase ability and confidence to explore new ideas	Work with mentors and role models to encourage students in risk-taking exercises that develop self-confidence.	Help schools create work/study programs that challenge students to use skills and knowledge from classroom.	Advocate links between social services and the schools.

Goal 2: To Extend the Capacity of Teachers

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Extend knowledge of subject and applications	Direct or sponsor subject-area workshops. Provide corporate resource people to work with teachers on special projects.	Provide funds for released time so teachers can attend classes, workshops, and seminars in subject. Provide summer experiences that extend both academic and workplace skills.	Advocate changes in teacher certification.
2. Learn and use different teaching strategies	Retain experienced educators to run workshops on a variety of teaching techniques.	Fund site visits to other schools. Provide teacher training workshops on effectively using technology in the classroom.	Advocate different ways to assess good teaching.
3. Have time, resources, and support	Run team-building workshops in the schools.	Help schools establish, use, and maintain computer networks for teachers. Provide grants and awards to support and recognize effective teaching.	Advocate changes in scheduling and class size.

Goal 3: To Create School Systems that Encourage Innovation

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Develop leadership skills for goal-setting and creating opportunities for change	Provide executives-on-loan or consultants for strategic planning.	Provide training materials for team management strategies.	Help schools find ways to build community support for educational reform.
2. Redesign management structure	Run and/or support management training workshops on team-building and shared decision-making. Train members of local school councils on financial statements, consensus building, and management techniques.	Provide schools with equipment and training to establish effective data processing procedures and reports.	Serve on school boards or local school councils. Advocate assessment and replication of model schools.
3. Change education policy to support innovation	Work on local, state, and national task forces and coalitions promoting school-based restructuring.	Provide grants for research on effective strategies for restructuring schools and school systems.	Advocate changes to rules and regulations hindering effective school management, teaching, and learning. Advocate attention to the impact of social problems on education.

Goal 4: To Develop Effective Assessment Tools

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Set criteria for skills and knowledge	Help schools and districts specify criteria for teaching high-level academic skills. Serve as consultants for helping schools collect, assess, and evaluate student records and research data.	Provide grants for research on effective assessment strategies.	Advocate a balanced set of expectations in broad education goals and workplace skills.
2. Develop tools to measure mastery and proficiency	Provide qualified experts to run training workshops on proficiency assessment.	Provide materials, equipment, and training to teachers interested in portfolio assessment.	Support the ongoing development of appropriate tests and proficiency measures.
3. Create evaluation standards and scoring rubrics	Provide statistical consultants to work with schools and districts to establish outcome, reliability, and validity measures.	Provide funds to help teachers and schools experiment with new assessment strategies.	Advocate the ongoing development and use of better assessment tools.

It is also critically important for business partners to recognize that teachers need flexible scheduling, small classes, stable student populations, and expanded resources if they are to teach all their students effectively; once they understand these needs, business leaders must be willing to advocate changes in existing educational policies that obstruct good teaching practices. A specific goal of the Panasonic Foundation is to advocate just these changes in its partner schools and districts.

To achieve the kind of teaching and learning desired from restructured schools, **school systems must be created which encourage innovation.** But the kinds of management and decision-making changes required often threaten the status quo and require patience and the long-term commitment of educators and community and business leaders. In Champion International's partnership described in Chapter 3, the company assigned full-time staff to work with school leaders and teachers to help change school management by, among other things, developing management-training workshops and seminars which help the district explore different change strategies for itself. In all three example partnerships, the school and corporate partners found it useful to hire consultants with first-hand experience in restructuring to assist the district, whether full-time (as in the examples of Pacific Telesis and Champion International) or on an as-needed basis (in Panasonic's partnership program). Whatever the means of involvement, partnership activities need to find ways to infuse flexibility into the system and encourage experimentation in new management structures.

Methods of assessing effective teaching and learning in the school setting are outside the purview of companies, and many business partners may feel that their involvement in reaching this goal is inappropriate. However, all the efforts to restructure schools will not have any long-term impact on public education unless it is possible to measure whether new teaching and learning strategies succeed. There are three important ways business partners can support the **development of effective assessment tools**: first, by using their experience in proficiency evaluations within the company to help train teachers and principals in new methods of assessing student achievement; second, by funding research and development of new standards and assessment tools; and third, by advocating changes in local, state, and national policy to accommodate the use of different evaluation strategies.

Identify Costs in Resources and Personnel

As we have seen, partnerships linked to a school restructuring agenda require a substantial commitment of staff, time, resources, and energy. The process of working through an evaluation of academic needs, setting district goals, and developing strategies for involvement demands the sustained attention of knowledgeable people. It has already been suggested that companies may want to limit their involvement to two or three priority issues to make sure that their activities are directed toward creating real change in the school system. Even so, they should be prepared to commit staff who will be able to keep informed on these issues and their impact on local schools. Both partners should be ready to make long-term commitments of people, energy, time.

Building a successful partnership is complicated by the different expectations, policies, and customs that characterize the work culture of individual partners. To avoid or mitigate tensions, partners need to identify potential problems within the company as well as within

the community. By anticipating and preparing for these differences, a partnership can more easily establish a common vision for its restructuring agenda.

For example, to avoid problems caused by misunderstandings, the school district must know the extent of the resources it has available for the partnership. It must identify the material, staff, and time it is able to commit, but it must also consider how these resources are managed and whether management strategies need to be changed. Partners, in turn, need to have a clear understanding of the role each is willing to assume and the extent of their commitment. In addition, it is essential that they develop the means to protect the partnership from disruptions created by the departure of a school, company, or community leader who has been an integral part of the change process.

It is also important that partners understand some of the potential obstacles from outside the partnership that could derail it and hinder the implementation of reform strategies. For example, parents and/or community groups sometimes find their interests threatened by proposed changes; the partnership can avoid a confrontation by keeping them informed and, if possible, involved in the reform agenda and the strategies developed to affect change. If state and federal education programs present economic barriers to some of the proposed changes, partners could help school systems seek necessary waivers and lobby for revisions to educational policy. By anticipating these and similar obstacles to change, the partnership can avoid being sidetracked from its focus on school restructuring and reform.

Monitor, Assess, and Evaluate Outcomes

Partnerships play a significant role in the reform process by keeping schools and systems accountable for meeting restructuring goals. As outsiders to the school system, corporate, community, and university leaders can provide a useful perspective as critical yet supportive partners. They can help create procedures to keep track of the school and school system's progress toward reaching restructuring outcomes and can develop ways to make adjustments in strategies as needed.

When South Carolina passed the Education Improvement Act in 1984, it legislated, among other things, the Division of Public Accountability, which monitors state school reform initiatives. Each year South Carolina's education system is reviewed and a public assessment report on the impact of the Education Improvement Act is issued. Among other things, the assessment covers:

- **Academic achievement:** Monitors standardized test scores (including the Basic Skills Assessment Program, Cognitive Skills Assessment Program, Scholastic Aptitude Test, National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the state Exit Exam), dropout rates, student and teacher attendance, and college success.
- **Services to students:** Reviews enrollment in and success of remedial and compensatory programs, gifted and talented programs, vocational programs, advanced placement and other academically challenging courses, school intervention programs, and others.

- **Services to school personnel:** Reports on teacher salaries, teacher and principal incentive programs, in-service training, teacher recruitment, teacher and principal certification and assessment, and centers of excellence.
- **School conditions:** Provides information on physical conditions of schools; school safety; truancy, suspensions, and expulsions; school incentive reward programs; competitive grants for teachers and schools.
- **Community involvement:** Tracks the number of business/education partnerships and school volunteer programs; surveys parents and community members on school-home relations and school-community relations; reviews success of public education foundations and school improvement councils.
- **Public confidence:** Reports on opinions and attitudes toward schools and public education, teachers and the teaching profession, principals, and educational preparation; tracks enrollment in public and private schools.

This annual assessment information allows the state education department as well as local school districts to revise their programs as needed to achieve reform goals. At both state and local levels, South Carolina business partners keep educators focused on achievable reform outcomes and work with them to develop strategies to reach those goals. It seems apparent from the South Carolina experience that one way to effectively sustain the reform process is to institutionalize accountability procedures. Local partnerships should build on this experience and incorporate an assessment component at the outset that monitors and evaluates reform strategies.

Some schools, companies, and other partners may be made uneasy by public scrutiny of how well they meet their reform goals. Not every program is successful; not every new method for teaching or learning works well. As schools and districts begin to experiment with different strategies, they will need partners who enable them to risk failure. Companies can then use the successes — and failures — of the reform process as a hallmark of their willingness to learn, along with their partners, how best to achieve their goals.

Manage the Partner Relationship

One of the most striking features of reform-model partnerships is their intention to make substantive changes which are designed to replace a status quo. Since the change process is complicated by interrelated issues, the more successful partners are at reaching desired outcomes, the more likely it is that they must also address a network of associated problems. Furthermore, once changes have been made, partners must work hard to get them integrated into the system. These concerns differ significantly from those faced in traditional partnerships, which are created to reside within a school and enhance its existing academic programs. The following example may help to illustrate the complexity of focusing a partnership on restructuring outcomes.

A company and school form a partnership designed to extend the capacity of teachers for elementary school science classes. They identify three goals to help them reach this outcome: (1) to help teachers gain more subject area knowledge and expertise, (2) to provide teachers with a variety of different ways to involve students in learning the subject, and (3) to help teachers identify and secure the materials and resources they need for their classes.

These three simple goals lead to a number of possible options for the partnership. They develop comprehensive, regularly scheduled training workshops and extensive follow-up in the different scientific subjects, in "hands-on" teaching strategies, in setting up and using demonstrations and exhibits effectively, in science applications both inside and outside the classroom, and so on. They bring teachers and students into company research labs to see science in action. They provide equipment and train teachers and students on its use. Industry scientists teach classes, tutor and mentor students, and otherwise help teachers encourage students to learn science. This activity prompts teachers to find ways to develop projects for students that exhibit learning in several subject areas, to plan and teach subjects jointly, or to visit each other's classrooms to observe and consult about teaching methods.

To benefit from activities developed by the partnership and those created by their own initiative, teachers quickly realize two glaring needs: time (which does not now exist in their schedules) and manageable class sizes.

The interactive, regularly scheduled workshops require attendance time as well as time for teachers to develop ways to implement new methods. Classes that encourage students to work together performing experiments and writing reports need to last more than 50 minutes. Interdisciplinary teaching requires time to meet and plan with other teachers, time to visit each other's classrooms and discuss teaching techniques. And teaching strategies that result in all students' mastering the subject require that teachers have fewer students so that they can work with them individually and know how well they're learning the subject.

So what kinds of changes are we talking about? The school will need to extend class periods and juggle schedules so that several teachers have the same hour or two for planning. It will have to encourage teachers to make their own curricular decisions and support the kind of teaching they want to undertake. It may assign several teachers and the same group of students to work together through all their subjects. It will have to develop better ways to measure how well students have mastered problem-solving skills as well as information.

To ensure that these new ways of teaching and assessing are effectively carried out, the school will probably need to hire more teachers. It will certainly need to release teachers from some activities so that they have the time they need for additional planning, preparation, more student contact, and different assessment strategies. And these changes in teaching and learning will, of necessity, lead to different kinds of teaching reviews by principals and superintendents, who will, in turn, need management training seminars.

And on it goes. Changes of this kind require school and business partners to exhibit great patience and diplomacy as they manage a comprehensive set of relationships. Reform-model partnerships exhibit two essential ingredients; they are outcome-oriented and they are flexible. The partners must remain clearly focused on restructuring goals and continually monitor partnership activities to make sure they lead to achieving those outcomes. Although everyone should participate in the decision-making process, it is the mission statement and reform goals that guide the development and implementation of programs and activities. And the partners must maintain a certain flexibility to make the

midcourse corrections that may become necessary within the partnership relationship as well as in its activities.

Sustaining a good working relationship between or among partners is critical to the success of the partnership. A director or manager should be hired to manage day-by-day activities and keep the restructuring efforts of the partnership on course. Both school and company should assign individuals the responsibility to maintain and strengthen the commitment to the partnership. In many cases, these school and company representatives may serve on an advisory board to oversee the reform and keep activities on target.

To be effective, each partnership must also establish procedures to monitor the process for reaching its objectives. Activities should be carefully documented by a statement of purpose, a description of needs being addressed, measurable outcomes, a plan of action, and assessments of the program's success. It is important that unexpected outcomes are noted and problems are identified and used to adjust the program. Partnerships, like every relationship, change and evolve over time; therefore, they must be flexible enough to adapt to new problems and situations while maintaining a clear vision of the type of learning and teaching they expect from the schools. Throughout the process, there must be frequent communication through progress reports and summaries on the partnership's success and what is being learned.

Implementation Strategies in Context

Building partnerships to promote school restructuring does not take place in a political vacuum. Among the constituent groups with an immediate vested interest in schooling are the superintendent, administrators and staff, teachers and faculty, the school board, unions (for teachers, principals, building superintendents, and others), and parents. Each of these groups has its own agenda and special interests, and none is likely to relinquish influence or power easily. Other members of the community also concerned about the quality of education are companies, colleges, and universities (who need high-quality graduates to enter their realms), and the community at large (which needs informed and productive citizens).

In an ideal world, a district's plans to restructure its schools would grow out of a communitywide recognition that their schools need to do a better job educating their students and that there are effective teaching and learning strategies they can implement. (A recent survey revealed that, while most Americans think schools are doing a poor job, over 70 per cent think their child's school is good.) In an ideal world, all members of the community would examine the current state of education in their communities; they would identify the kind of education they expect schools to provide; they would know what is needed to bridge the predictable gaps; and they would understand how best to implement reforms. They would then work together to support and encourage the district and the schools as they experiment with different strategies to become model places of learning.

The experience of most communities, however, is less than ideal. Even when there is agreement that the schools need to improve (and, in spite of the evidence of falling test scores and rising dropout rates, such agreement is by no means assured), there are inherent difficulties in collaborating with representatives from a variety of organizations.

Public education is a highly politicized world that businesses should enter with caution. Regardless of the size or type of community, those interested in helping a school district begin the difficult, long-term process of restructuring must understand that there are risks involved and be prepared for potential problems.

The general principles discussed at length throughout this report should guide a company's efforts to help its partner schools restructure, but different constraints should be kept in mind depending upon the size and type of community which the schools serve and the relationship of the company to the community. Corporate, educational, and political leaders need to accommodate their different cultures, needs, and points of view as they struggle to identify educational goals and devise a workable strategy to reach them.

The principal company in a small community: When a company plays the dominant role in a city or town, it naturally assumes a leadership role in every aspect of the community, including education. The opportunities for informal interaction between executives and school administrators, between teachers and the community, lead to a good understanding of the school system, its goals, and its needs. In many cases employees serve on the school board and spouses work for the school system. In all likelihood, the schools already depend upon the company for special resources and materials, field trips, and school volunteers. While there are obvious advantages to such close interaction, the company can be in an awkward position if its perceptions of the kinds of changes needed in the system do not coincide with those of school officials. Unless a carefully thought-out strategic plan for reform is developed early, the company may find it hard to focus its programs on substantive reform and avoid getting caught up in the details of the school. In addition, the company should be prepared for the disagreements and difficulties that surface in any major change initiative. The community should understand that the company is knowledgeable about local needs and goals and ready to support and encourage the district's reform efforts.

One of several companies in a medium-sized town: For those companies who, with five or six others, form a major corporate presence in a community, the options of involvement in school restructuring efforts increase. In some cases, a company may simply provide financial or material support for a reform-oriented project in the schools; at other times it may work closely with school personnel to develop an effective program in support of restructuring goals. Both companies and school districts need to make sure that efforts are not duplicated unnecessarily and that the various partnerships are all directed toward changing the schools. Often companies work through organizations like the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, or service clubs in concert with other companies to advise and encourage a district as it develops a reform agenda. Companies of all sizes can effectively get involved in restructuring when they work within such a coalition, each company identifying specific areas in which they can make appropriate contributions of time, people, or resources.

One of many companies in a major urban center: An advantage for companies in large urban areas is the variety of opportunities to get involved in school reform activities. This can also be a disadvantage, however, and companies sometimes feel overwhelmed by the

complicated problems facing urban schools. Health and housing issues, economic disparities, and different ethnic groups within the student population present difficulties that must be attended to as well as the initiating of academic and structural reforms in the schools and system. Although it is considerably easier for companies in a large urban setting to select the piece of the reform agenda that most suits their own interests and capabilities, it is harder to avoid "reinventing the wheel" and proposing new programs that simply layer on top of existing programs. Only through extensive collaboration and coordination — which is a time-consuming and frustrating process — can corporate involvement truly help the schools and school systems succeed in restructuring schools.

The greatest risk of change is the risk implicit in taking action. By acting, we choose to proceed in a certain direction, in a certain way; and once we make that choice, we lose the possibilities that lie in other directions and in other means. We can never really know if the choice we made — and the action we took — are the best. And our choices and actions may be counter to the values and requirements of other constituent groups in the education community.

The Future Role of Partnerships

In all this discussion of business/school partnerships and school restructuring, we must remain clear about what we really want to achieve. We want to create a school community that encourages and supports better student learning. In truth, we are not really sure what is the best way to reach this goal, but the ideas, examples, and suggestions in this report present our best guesses. The challenges facing the school reform movement are daunting and, as various school restructuring experiments have demonstrated, achieving whole-school change requires the long-term dedication and cooperation of many different interest groups. Schools do not have the sustained resources to restructure themselves, but no reform will occur if it is imposed on a disinterested school. Given these difficulties, partnerships themselves must be reformed; only when partnerships are consciously linked to restructuring goals are they likely to help schools and school systems achieve genuine reform.

For Further Reading

About Partnerships

Evans, Angela. *Starting Smart: Choosing an Appropriate Partnership with Schools*. Canadian-American Committee Research Document No. 1. Washington, DC: National Planning Association, 1990.

Gross, Theodore L. *Partners in Education: How Colleges Can Work with Schools to Improve Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1985.

Kolderie, Ted. "Education That Works: The Right Role for Business." *Harvard Business Review* (1987), 56-62.

Levine, Marsha, and Roberta Trachtman, eds. *American Business and the Public School: Case Studies of Corporate Involvement in Public Education*. New York: Columbia University/Teachers College Press, 1988.

Lund, Leonard. *Beyond Business/Education Partnerships: The Business Experience*. New York: Conference Board, 1988.

Mann, Dale. "Business Involvement and Public School Improvement, Part I." *Phi Delta Kappan* (October 1987), 123-128; "Business Involvement and Public School Improvement, Part II." *Phi Delta Kappan* (November 1987), 228-232.

Oakes, Jeannie, and Martin Lipton. *Making the Best of Schools: A Handbook for Parents, Teachers, and Policymakers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Rigden, Diana. *Business and the Schools: A Guide to Effective Programs*. New York: Council for Aid to Education, 1989. [Second edition forthcoming, 1991.]

How to Form Partnerships

Adams, Don, and Paul Snodgrass, eds. *A Manager's Handbook to Partnerships: How to Set-Up, Run and Maintain Partnerships*. Ellenton, FL: InfoMedia, 1990.

Blair, Louis H., et al. *Guidelines for School-Business Partnerships in Science and Mathematics*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press, 1990.

How to Form and Operate a Local Alliance. A publication of the Triangle Coalition for Science and Technology Education. Washington, DC: National Science Teachers Association, 1986.

Lacey, Richard A., and Christopher Kingsley. *A Guide to Working Partnerships*. A publication of The Center for Human Resources, The Heller School. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1988.

McDonald, Nancy, et al. *A Practical Guide to Creating and Managing a Business/Education Partnership*. Arlington, VA: National Association of Partners in Education, 1990.

O'Connell, Carol. *How to Start a School/Business Partnership*. Fastback Series, 226. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1985.

Onuska, Sheila. *Company-School Collaboration: A Manual for Developing Successful Projects*. Washington, DC: American Council of Life Insurance, n.d.

Otterbourg, Susan D. *School Partnerships Handbook: How to Set Up and Administer Programs with Business, Government, and Your Community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Otterbourg, Susan D., and Don Adams, eds. *Partnerships in Education: Measuring Their Success*. Ellenton, FL: InfoMedia, 1989.

Acknowledgments

An early draft of this report framed the context for a business partnership seminar at the 1990 National Symposium of Partners in Education in Arlington, Virginia, and the comments and discussion at that seminar helped develop many ideas presented here. Participants of the seminar were: Verna G. Bennett, *Mobil Corporation*; Doris Carpenter, *McKee Baking Company*; Junius Davidson, *Schering-Plough Corporation*; Eva Lynne Disbro, *McKee Baking Company*; Thomas S. Donahoe, *Pacific Telesis Foundation*; Thomas W. Evans, *Mudge, Rose, Guthrie, Alexander & Ferdon*; Mutui O. Fagbayi, *Eastman Kodak Company*; Mel Gallagher, *Exxon Chemical Company*; David Goodman, *The Clorox Company*; Elizabeth Harvey, *The Clorox Company*; Cyrus Holley, *Engelhard Corporation*; Jim Jamieson, *Northwest Airlines*; Gayle Jasso, *Security Pacific Corporation*; Alice Jelin, *The New England*; Mary E. Leslie, *Pacific Telesis Foundation*; Kathy W. Nepean, *The Boeing Company*; Tamara Pettit, *Weirton Steel Company*; John J. Perez, *Rockwell International*; Laurisa Sellers, *Honeywell Foundation*; Roy Spiller, *Pratt & Whitney*; Nancy Van Doren, *Travelers Companies*; Terrence R. Ward, *H&R Block Foundation*; Bonnie J. White, *NYNEX Corporation*.

I would like to thank those who provided insights on the partnership process through extended conversations and interviews: Barbara Barnes, *Managing Excellence in Education*; Wayne Carlson, *Los Angeles Unified School District*; Mary E. Leslie, *Pacific Telesis Foundation*; and Susan D. Otterbourg, *Delman Educational Communications*.

And I am especially grateful to those who reviewed the manuscript and offered helpful comments and advice: Charles O. DeRiemer, *Southwestern Bell Foundation*; Gael Doar, *Champion International Corporation*; Thomas S. Donahoe, *Pacific Telesis Foundation*; David S. Ford, *The Chase Manhattan Bank*; Daniel C. Humphreys, *Teachers College, Columbia University*; Virginia Millan, *Metropolitan Life Foundation*; Barry Morris, *Tenneco Inc.*; Sophie Sa, *Panasonic Foundation*.

Although I benefited from the meetings, conversations, and interviews described above, the ideas and suggestions expressed in this report are my own and should be attributed to the author and the Council for Aid to Education.

Diana W. Rigden

Precollege Advisory Board Members

Robert C. Allen, Director, Corporate Contributions
Duke Power Company

Pamela Arledge, Manager, Community Relations
Southern Bell

Michael Bivens, Education Program Manager
Coca-Cola Foundation

Emelda Cathcart, Director, Corporate Contributions
Time Warner Inc.

Charles O. DeRiemer, Executive Director
Southwestern Bell Foundation

David S. Ford, Vice President, Director of Philanthropy
The Chase Manhattan Bank N.A.

Sondra J. Hardis, Manager, Education Programs
BP America Inc.

Cheryl Kubelick, Manager, Contributions & Community Affairs
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

John L. Mason, President
Monsanto Fund

Westina Matthews, Manager, Corporate Contributions
Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.

Jacqueline R. Millan, Manager, Corporate Contributions
PepsiCo, Inc.

Virginia Millan, Program Associate in Education
Metropolitan Life Foundation

Sophie Sa, Executive Director
Panasonic Foundation

Bess Stephens, Education Relations Manager
Hewlett-Packard Company Foundation

Barry Morris, Executive Assistant to the Chairman for Education
Tenneco Inc.

Nancy Van Doren, President
Travelers Companies Foundation

Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring*

American business made elementary and secondary education its business in the 1980s. As schools and districts began to examine common practices and make necessary changes to promote good teaching and learning, companies joined schools as partners in the reform process, offering critical support and encouragement.

The direction a partnership takes, the methods it uses to promote school change, and its success with different strategies are all strongly influenced by local needs and policies. What works well in a medium-sized community may not have the same success within a large urban system. Overall reform principles, however, remain consistent. Below are some general guidelines for companies interested in support of school-based restructuring efforts.

The Role of Partnerships in Supporting School Reform

Business/school partnerships encompass a variety of different relationships, but it is possible to characterize most of them as belonging to one of three primary configurations: adopt-a-school model, project-driven model, and reform model. These are not altogether tidy distinctions. Partnerships change over time, acquiring greater complexity as partners develop a commitment to undertake long-term reforms or shift their priorities to meet the needs and interests of changing players.

The Adopt-a-School Partnership

What it is: Adopt-a-school partnerships are usually created between a single company and a single school to provide resources and volunteers to support school activities.

What it can accomplish: Especially within the context of increased government cut-backs in education spending, the adopt-a-school partnership offers schools much-needed resources and important additional adult interaction for students. And it is often through an adopt-a-school relationship that school and business people can develop the sense of trust and confidence in each other that lays the foundation for other types of partnerships.

*The ideas and information presented are excerpted from a recent report, *Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring*, available from the Council for Aid to Education.

The Project-Driven Partnership

What it is: Project-driven partnerships are formed to address specific academic or social problems. Project-driven partnerships are often developed through close interaction between school and company employees; they may import successful programs created and tested elsewhere; they may serve as a vehicle to oversee academic programs run by universities for the schools.

What it can accomplish: Project-driven partnerships are excellent vehicles for enhancing course work and extending learning opportunities for all students involved in the project. They can change attitudes and practices in the classroom, school, and school system and can significantly improve teaching and learning.

The Reform-Model Partnership

What it is: Often developing out of relationships established through earlier partnerships, the reform-model partnership focuses on system change: finding ways to change the learning and teaching environment by expanding the responsibilities and roles of students, extending teaching practices and empowering teachers, changing the organizational and management structure within schools and districts, and developing proficiency model assessment tools.

What it can accomplish: Reform-model partnerships seek changes that become embedded in the system and remain in place and supportive of structural reform over the long term.

Five Steps to Developing Reform-Model Partnership

The five steps to developing a partnership aimed at helping schools and school systems change are different in focus and application from those steps taken to form traditional partnerships. The mission, goals, and strategies of reform-model partnerships are centered on the task of challenging current school practices (teaching, learning, and management) and developing school-based system change.

1. Agree on Specific Goals. Partners in a reform-model partnership must identify partnership outcomes that directly relate to restructuring outcomes.

2. Develop Strategies for Involvement. In reform-model partnerships these strategies for involvement must not only be directed at helping the district make the changes necessary to achieve restructuring goals but also at incorporating those changes into the structure of the school and district.

3. Identify Costs in Resources and Personnel. All partners must understand the additional costs in resources and personnel that the restructuring effort will require.

4. Monitor, Assess, and Evaluate Outcomes. The partners need to establish a system to monitor, assess, and evaluate how well partnership activities help the school and school system reach restructuring goals.

5. Manage the Partner Relationship. The partner relationship must be managed so that it effectively fulfills its responsibility as a catalyst to school restructuring.

How Reform-Model Partnerships Can Address Restructuring Goals

To Increase Student Learning, companies can:

- Provide funds to experiment with flexible staffing and schedules
- Use coaching techniques to mentor students
- Help students learn their role as "workers"
- Develop workshops for parents
- Help connect students to appropriate community agencies

To Extend the Capacity of Teachers, companies can:

- Bring in experts to expand teachers' skills
- Extend teacher internships through "sharing" workshops
- Develop training programs for teachers and volunteers
 - Teaching techniques
 - Mentoring
 - Tutoring

To Create School Systems That Encourage Innovation, companies can:

- Help educators assess needs, set goals, and develop strategic plans
- Help district hire qualified director for restructuring process
- Bring in experts to expand managerial skills
- Bring in consultants to provide expertise to teachers and staff
- Help schools better inform the community of reform efforts

To Develop Effective Assessment Tools, companies can:

- Help schools generate, manage, and use assessment information
- Encourage districts to identify and develop measurable goals
- Help teachers create performance-based assessment strategies
- Work with administrators to institute an interactive evaluation process

Strategies for Involvement in Reform-Model Partnerships

COMMENT: Given the nature of school-based system reform, companies forming a partnership with a restructuring school or district must work closely with teachers and staff to coordinate their human and material resources and advocacy roles to restructuring goals.

Goal 1: To Increase Student Learning

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Master course work -reading -writing -mathematics	Provide training in coaching skills for tutors, mentors, and employee volunteers.	Link gifts of lab equipment, books, computer technology and software to teacher training. Provide grants for curricular programs directed toward restructuring goals.	Advocate national standards.
2. Develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills	Provide scientists and lecturers trained to help students discover solutions to real-world problems.	Design summer job experiences and internships to help students develop higher-order skills.	Advocate changes to student assessment programs.
3. Increase ability and confidence to explore new ideas	Work with mentors and role models to encourage students in risk-taking exercises that develop self-confidence.	Help schools create work/study programs that challenge students to use skills and knowledge from classroom.	Advocate links between social services and the schools.

Goal 2: To Extend the Capacity of Teachers

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Extend knowledge of subject and applications	Direct or sponsor subject-area workshops. Provide corporate resource people to work with teachers on special projects.	Provide funds for released time so teachers can attend classes, workshops, and seminars in subject. Provide summer experiences that extend both academic and workplace skills.	Advocate changes in teacher certification.
2. Learn and use different teaching strategies	Retain experienced educators to run workshops on a variety of teaching techniques.	Fund site visits to other schools. Provide teacher training workshops on effectively using technology in the classroom.	Advocate different ways to assess good teaching.
3. Have time, resources, and support	Run team-building workshops in the schools.	Help schools establish, use, and maintain computer networks for teachers. Provide grants and awards to support and recognize effective teaching.	Advocate changes in scheduling and class size.

Goal 3: To Create School Systems that Encourage Innovation

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Develop leadership skills for goal-setting and creating opportunities for change	Provide executives-on-loan or consultants for strategic planning.	Provide training materials for team management strategies.	Help schools find ways to build community support for educational reform.
2. Redesign management structure	Run and/or support management training workshops on team-building and shared decision-making. Train members of local school councils on financial statements, consensus building, and management techniques.	Provide schools with equipment and training to establish effective data processing procedures and reports.	Serve on school boards or local school councils. Advocate assessment and replication of model schools.
3. Change education policy to support innovation	Work on local, state, and national task forces and coalitions promoting school-based restructuring.	Provide grants for research on effective strategies for restructuring schools and school systems.	Advocate changes to rules and regulations hindering effective school management, teaching, and learning. Advocate attention to the impact of social problems on education.

Goal 4: To Develop Effective Assessment Tools

School Reform Outcomes	Possible Company Involvement		
	Human Resources	Material Resources	Advocacy
1. Set criteria for skills and knowledge	Help schools and districts specify criteria for teaching high-level academic skills. Serve as consultants for helping schools collect, assess, and evaluate student records and research data.	Provide grants for research on effective assessment strategies.	Advocate a balanced set of expectations in broad education goals and workplace skills.
2. Develop tools to measure mastery and proficiency	Provide qualified experts to run training workshops on proficiency assessment.	Provide materials, equipment, and training to teachers interested in portfolio assessment.	Support the ongoing development of appropriate tests and proficiency measures.
3. Create evaluation standards and scoring rubrics	Provide statistical consultants to work with schools and districts to establish outcome, reliability, and validity measures.	Provide funds to help teachers and schools experiment with new assessment strategies.	Advocate the ongoing development and use of better assessment tools.

**COUNCIL FOR AID TO
EDUCATION**

51 Madison Avenue
Suite 2200
New York, New York 10010
212/689-2400